J
11
.R
V.112
appx
Jan10-Feb28

Appendix

Philadelphia's Remarkable Mayor Tate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. BARRETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, under adverse circumstances and unforeseen crises, Mayor James H. J. Tate took over the reigns of the Philadelphia city government.

During this period Mayor Tate was faced with the difficult task of administering a safe and efficient government.

Jim Tate is continuing to do an effective and productive job as you will see while reading the enclosed article entitled, "1966: Mayor's Aim Is Progress," which appeared in the Philadelphia Bulletin on Sunday, January 2, 1966:

1966: MAYOR'S AIM IS PROGRESS

(By Kos Semonski of the Bulletin staff)

Mayor Tate yesterday took an end-of-the-year look at his administration and spoke of its accomplishments, disappointments, and plans.

He was speaking as the city's acting mayor for 2 years, its elected mayor with 2 more years in office, and candidate for reelection in 1967.

Looking forward he said:

"We want to implement the President's Great Society program in Philadelphia on as extensive a scale as possible.

NEW PROGRAMS

"For this purpose, we have six task forces working—on housing, city beautiful, public works, medicare, open space, air pollution."

The welfare department, Tate said, has a medicare program nearly completed. It will be ready for announcement early in January.

New programs for the elderly and added emphasis on commercial and industrial development are also in the offing, the mayor said.

OUT OF STEP

The city's economic growth alone will not be sufficient to provide the money needed to deal with Philadelphia's problems, Tate said. Success in solving them will depend upon the amount of Federal and State aid the city is able to get.

One of the most significant acts of his administration to date, Tate said, was the saving of the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

One of his greatest disappointments, he said, lies in the delays that have beset construction of the $25 million sports stadium to be built at Broad Street and Pattison Avenue.

"Every time the stadium situation seemed to be solved," the mayor said, "another debate broke out. I hope the latest one can be resolved quickly so as not to further delay construction."

THE HIGHEST OFFICE

Tate succeeded Richardson Dilworth as mayor. Dilworth was elected to the office when Joseph S. Clark, the city's first Democratic mayor in modern times, went to the U.S. Senate.

Tate became acting mayor in February 1962, when Dilworth resigned to run for Governor, a race he lost to Governor Scranton. Tate, president of city council at the time, stepped into the city's highest office. Here are some of his comments on the first 2 years:

"It was a time of transition. It was a time when I picked up the commitments of Clark and Dilworth, commitments designed to give the city progress," Tate recalled.

"The immediate problem was to keep the city payroll from growing too quickly. We held down the number of employees and tried to keep the number down to about 30,000."

THE PROMISE

To do this, he explained, a "freeze board," headed by the mayor was established. The board acted to establish only jobs that were needed, Tate said.

"We had to cut back annual appropriations for some departments to make good a promise there would be no tax increase for 4 years," Tate said.

The cutbacks created new problems, Tate said, but helped to better the city's credit rating.

A year after he replaced Dilworth, Tate found himself faced with civil rights issues and civil disobedience.

Pickets ringed city hall, the new Municipal Services Building. They showed up at schools and held sitdowns in the mayor's reception room and the offices of the managing director. The North Philadelphia riots followed in August 1964.

LAW AND ORDER

"It was the beginning of a change in the responsibilities of the mayor in Philadelphia," Tate said. "No longer was the mayor's job to oversee routine housekeeping. It became very obvious that the mayor's responsibilities were now to maintain law and order and to work to eliminate the causes of an extraordinary crime situation.

"A mayor also has to take an active interest in causes of mass demonstrations and group complaints. He has to be concerned with civil rights, welfare services, better living conditions, congestion and blight, proper balance in residential redevelopment, commercial and industrial development.

"We found it necessary to resurvey the police needs for Philadelphia and attempt to establish a crime prevention program. We had to begin building better police protection.

BETTER COMMUNICATIONS

"We put on 300 more policemen and found that this was not enough. Some police districts were thinly organized. Police cars were too slow. They were purchased in the past to save money, but they provided little efficiency for police.

"We have now replaced almost the entire fleet. We found it necessary to improve radio communications. These and other improvements required more money and other departments had to be cut back. We had to maintain a sound financial structure.

"One of the casualties was the streets department which lost $2 million in its 1965 budget. This hurt our street cleaning program. Men had to be put to work out of job classification.

"Laborers had to drive trucks. Others had to be upgraded. Many of the men were not getting paid well at all. This led to a survey out of which came a new plan."

Another difficulty of the first 2 years was city-county consolidation.

"We tried to carry out the Clark and Dilworth program for city-county consolidation, but were held back because certain real estate and political interests wanted to protect the board of revision of taxes," said Tate.

After his election as mayor in November 1963, Tate began pushing for acquisition of PTC by an authority. Dilworth had proposed acquisition by the city.

The Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority was established. SEPTA began negotiations and court actions to acquire PTC.

"We were aided by Dilworth who became counsel for acquisition on my recommendation," Tate said.

HARD WORKER

There were others who joined the administration forces. Tate singled out some of them but heaped praise on City Solicitor Edward G. Bauer, Jr., who, Tate said, "worked hard on the SEPTA project."

Other highlights of 1965 included the preparation of plans for the extension of the Broad Street subway into the Northeast and to the navy yard in South Philadelphia.

One of the key projects is a tunnel connecting PRR suburban station with Reading terminal.

A LOT OF FINANCING

In addition to acquiring PTC, SEPTA is to acquire the Red Arrow Lines and other lines which would fit into a mass transportation system serving five counties.

"To take over the railroad commuter lines and other transportation systems will require a lot of financing," Tate pointed out. "The railroads are for coordinating the commuter lines, but at the moment they are concerned with future profits. They also want to protect the interests of their stockholders. These are problems that have to be worked out.

"Philadelphia has extraordinary responsibilities. It must get at the cause of the economic ills. It must provide good shelter. It must provide jobs, cultural and health centers, open space. We have to eliminate fire hazards, cut down on crime, provide for open space and lead in a program against air pollution," he continued.

"We need the support of the people who not only think about these problems, but those who contribute to them," Tate said.

The past year, Tate said, was a "year of progress.' The city got more money from the State. It had asked for $37.2 million and received nearly $30 million.

A new pay plan for city employees was established, and the police department was given more men and equipment with which to fight crime, he said.

During the year, council passed a record operating budget and, with it, increases in real estate and wage taxes.

THE YEARLY QUESTION

Describing the saving of the navy yard from a Defense Department shutdown, Tate said:

"Thanks to the many people who worked, keeping the 10,000 jobs was one of the greatest shots in the arm Philadelphia got in more than a generation.

"From year to year, we were faced with the question whether the navy yard was to be closed. Even some of the business interests gave up on keeping it open and suggested that it be turned into an industrial park.

"Now we have to move to increase the work force to 15,000 and then to 25,000 employees. I think that we can do this and this is one of the projects for 1966 and the future," Tate said.

Other accomplishments, said Tate, were the city's antipoverty program, completion of the Municipal Services Building, establishment of a port rehabilitation program, continued redevelopment, code enforcement and advances in industrial development.

A Salute to the Union of Burma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, the Union of Burma celebrated the 17th anniversary of her independence. Today it gives me great pleasure to extend heartiest congratulations, belatedly since the Congress was not in session, to His Excellency General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Union of Burma; to His Excellency U On Sein, the present Burmese Ambassador to the United States; and also to His Excellency U Tun Win, who will become the new Burmese Ambassador to the United States very soon.

The peoples of the world have long been fascinated with this beautiful and mysterious land. To her neighbors in India Burma is known as the golden peninsula because of the large reserves of uncrowded land and forests and plentiful minerals and gems. Rudyard Kipling expressed the Englishman's wonderment with Burma in his poem "Mandalay":

> Come you back to Mandalay,
> Where the old flotilla lay:
> Can't you 'ear their paddles chunkin' from
> Rangoon to Mandalay?
> On the road to Mandalay,
> Where the flyin' fishes play,
> An' the dawn comes up like thunder outer
> China 'crost the bay.

Burmese leaders characterize their nation's policy in international affairs as one of nonalinement, or the determination to resist entanglement in either of the power blocs of the cold war. A corollary of this neutralist posture is active support for the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Burma joined the United Nations in 1948 and has since worked to strengthen its many activities. She has participated in the UNESCO Research Center on Social Implications of Industrialization, in southeast Asia as well as in the Colombo Plan Council for Technical Cooperation, in south and southeast Asia. The specialized agencies to which Burma has given particularly outstanding service are the International Labor Organization and the Food and Agricultural Organization.

Symbolic of Burma's engagement in international relations is U Thant, Burmese citizen and presently the Secretary General of the United Nations. Formerly a Burmese civil servant, he is the first citizen from the developing nations to serve in this important post.

In addition to efforts to promote international harmony, Burma seeks forms of social, political, and economic order so that the Burmese people can enjoy national unity and economic prosperity. General Ne Win, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council of Burma, has sought to solve many of his country's problems through a plan known as the Socialist economic system for Burma. This project calls for the nationalization of such activities as industries, mines, and banks. Illustrative of this is the recent Government move to take over the administration of many civil hospitals and health centers in order to maintain uniform health service throughout the country.

Another example of the nation's effort to achieve economic well-being is a 5-year plan for construction of a hugh dockyard at Sinmalaik on the Hlaing River. Burmese students are being sent abroad for training in dockyard management so that when the dockyard is completed, there will be enough trained Burmese to run it efficiently.

Today we pause to send warmest wishes to the Burmese people and to reaffirm our belief that Burma's economic and political growth as a free nation is important to southeast Asia and to all the countries of the free world.

The Great Boston Power Play

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all surprised that the locating of the Electronics Research Center in the Boston area has run into difficulties, as evidenced by the following story by William Hines, science editor of the Washingston Star, which was printed in the Reader's Digest of January 1966:

THE GREAT BOSTON POWER PLAY

(By William Hines)[1]

One of the more appalling chapters in the long annals of Government empire-building can now be told. It is the classic case of how two tax-fed bureaucracies, one supposedly concerned with slums, the other aiming at the moon, have made a bizarre rendezvous in Boston, Mass. It typifies what can happen in America today under the banner of technology and progress.

The action began in the fall of 1962 when EDWARD "TEDDY" KENNEDY was elected to the U.S. Senate on the slogan, "He Can Do More for Massachusetts." Shortly afterward, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) delivered the more: the space agency announced that it would construct a $50-million electronics research center (ERC) in the Boston area. The center, which was to be one of a dozen test-and-research installations, would in 10 years employ 2,100 persons and would boast a $77-million annual budget. The need, argued NASA, was urgent.

But some things didn't ring true. Urgent? No such center had been advocated publicly prior to the election. Further, numerous experts were quick to note that the job proposed for ERC could easily be carried out at existing Government installations. A Senate committee passed a motion eliminating the center, but the vote was quickly reversed amid reports of phone calls from the White House. Most curious, NASA never bothered to send a site-selection board around the country before picking Metropolitan Boston. With this knowledge, the House Space Committee in late 1963 decided that the center's need was not conclusively proven and held up funds until further site studies could be furnished.

To no one's surprise, NASA bounced back in February 1964 with a thick volume favoring Boston over eight rival regions. "The decision was not intended to be changed, and it was not changed," snapped Ohio Senator FRANK LAUSCHE. With the new NASA justification, the project was quickly nourished by a preliminary $3,900,000 allocation.

Now events took an even more curious turn. Originally, NASA had proposed payment of $3 million for 1,000 acres somewhere in Boston's suburbs. This would save the taxpayers the cost of a split operation, since there would be room within the center for the 400-acre testing ground that was needed. But, as summer approached, NASA was found to be hungarily eyeing an area called Kendall Square in Cambridge, directly across the Charles River from Boston proper.

ENTER URBAN RENEWAL

Crammed with industry and business concerns, Kendall Square lies at the back of the sprawling campus of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, one of the world's leading scientific universities. Since World War II, more White House science advisers have come from MIT than from any other school. One of these is Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., its current chairman.

In the spring of 1964, three Boston urban-renewal officials came to Killian to discuss a seductive idea. Why not clear out a 42-acre tract in Kendall Square with urban renewal funds and sell most of the property to NASA for its electronics center? Not long after, behind closed doors, Cambridge Mayor Edward A. Crane and the city council listened to the same scheme, while Killian, whose name carries tremendous weight in Cambridge, sat by.

The action quickened. On July 2, NASA Chief James E. Webb let it be known that he thought Kendall Square had the greatest potential of all the sites NASA had seen. On July 27, the Cambridge City Council decided to apply for Federal urban renewal planning funds for the 42 acres and to offer 20 of those acres to NASA. That very day, Urban Renewal Administrator William Slayton gave his preliminary approval to the site as an urban renewal project. And on August 19 NASA formally accepted Cambridge's offer on the condition that it "provide cleared land to NASA under the Federal urban renewal procedures."

It was a splendid arrangement. The glamour of a Federal space center would grease the way for urban renewal which, realistically, didn't otherwise stand a chance of tearing up this thriving industrial area. NASA had captured a prize piece of real estate at a bargain-basement price—roughly $4 million—thanks to the fact that urban renewal would pay most of the "real" cost of the land and would take on the expense and dirty work of removing the occupants. And the Cambridge-Boston area was going to have all that money spent there.

---

[1] William Hines is science editor of the Washington Star and a national syndicated columnist specializing in space exploration.

FLY IN THE OINTMENT

There was only one catch: nobody had bothered to ask the opinion of the 94 businessmen and their 3,500 employees who were on the Kendall Square chopping block. Most didn't realize what had happened until they read the newspaper headlines on August 21; "$60 million NASA Plant To Be Built in Kendall Square."[2] Thus began a nightmare.

Arthur B. Kettle, Sr., executive vice president and general manager of the Austin-Hastings Co., Inc., a supplier of machinery and metal piping, was one of hundreds caught by surprise. He knew that his company could suffer a half million dollar loss just trying to move, and that wasn't the worst of it. Ninety-five percent of his orders had to be shipped within 24 hours for him to compete. Yet it would take at least 2 years to move inventory while trucks tried to run back and forth between two plants. "How many customers will we lose in a changeover?" he found himself wondering.

Then there was the problem of the company's employees. Austin-Hastings had a $750,000 yearly payroll of 100 employees and a record of never having laid off a worker. Kettle knew that 3 out of every 10 firms uprooted by urban renewal never reopen. Other executives all over Kendall Square began to face similar harrowing realities.

Taken together, these taxpaying companies (NASA wouldn't pay a cent of taxes) compose one of the most productive industrial areas in Massachusetts. More than two dozen have been in business for 30 years, many for five decades. They have an annual sales volume of $75 million, a $40-million-plant-and-equipment value, payrolls of $18 million a year.

But there was more to it than valued businesses. There were people—individuals who would suffer if the businesses moved or collapsed. Among them were refugees from previous urban-renewal projects in Cambridge and Boston who had relocated in Kendall Square in the certainty that it was safe. One filling station operator, for instance, had finally built up steady customers after years of sweat. "No one can compensate me for that," he says. Or take the elderly owner of a wrought-iron equipment firm—too discouraged and too far in the hole to make a second move because of urban renewal.

VOICE OF DISSENT

Still, because NASA was coming to town, they were supposed to give in meekly. But the planners, politicians, and university titans had miscalculated. Shortly after Labor Day 1964, the businessmen of Kendall Square formed a Committee for the Preservation of Cambridge Industry. Dr. John Brennan, vice president of the Electronics Corp. of America, was named chairman, and the battle was on.

"The use of the urban renewal statutes to allow NASA in here is a flagrant distortion of the fundamental purpose of the law," Brennan declared. He and others were shocked, because, with 29 acres going to NASA (70 percent of the tract),[3] the deal made a mockery of Massachusetts law, which says that urban renewal must give maximum opportunity to privately financed development. The dissenters also fiercely contended that Kendall Square's industrial area, while no garden spot, was far from a decadent area, as local urban renewal authorities desperately tried to prove. The single fact that the 94 concerns were doing $75 million a year worth of business raised grave questions as to the morality of bringing in the Federal bulldozer.

Confronted by organized opposition, NASA mounted a high-powered campaign to promote the space center. It set up temporary headquarters in an office building, partly owned by MIT, next to the proposed site. And Edward Martin, a former TEDDY KENNEDY aid, was hired to handle public relations. Added to this was a never-ending string of local speaking engagements by ERC officials. These talks oozed with juicy statistics. The center would bring 5,800 jobs to the area and $450 million buying power. That didn't count oodles of construction jobs over a 5-year period. And out of a $35 million budget for operating costs, much would be contracted to local industries.

LET THERE BE BLIGHT

Meanwhile, the urban renewal forces moved in for the kill. Late in 1964, a press release from Washington announced a $100,000 feasibility survey to determine whether Kendall Square was eligible for urban renewal. There was no pretense as to the outcome, however, the release sweepingly labeled the area as blighted.

As this campaign of disparagement went on, debate raged over how much the land taking and clearance would cost. The industrialists contended that the total expense could easily climb over $40 million. Urban-renewal authorities stuck to a ridiculously low $20 million figure. Only one thing was sure: U.S. taxpayers would ultimately have to pick up most of the bill, whatever it turned out to be. And the 400 acres of testing ground still had to be purchased somewhere in the suburbs.

In explaining just why the Kendall Square location was so vital, NASA outdid itself. The ERC should be within walking distance of MIT, it pointed out. An extra inducement was needed to draw some 450 junior scientists to NASA for work at $6,000 to $9,000 a year. With this location, said NASA, these young men could, if they wished to study for an advanced degree, get to graduate school classes at MIT and Harvard with a minimum of lost time.

To businessmen who saw generations of enterprise going down the drain, this was almost the last straw. Why, they asked, should 3,500 persons be uprooted to pamper 450 junior scientists?

It was all the more preposterous because a mere 3 miles down the Charles River from MIT the Defense Department's 119-acre Watertown Arsenal was in the process of being closed down. A simple solution was apparent to every rational mind; let the Army move out and NASA move in. But simple solutions are not Washington solutions. NASA rejected Watertown, giving as its main argument that the arsenal was too far from MIT. By private auto it is 10 minutes away; by public transportation (20 cents), no more than 20 minutes. No go: apparently the public transportation problem—one transfer—was too complex. (For an electronics engineer?)

Representative SILVIO CONTE, of Massachusetts, angrily observed: "Any private business that bungled its affairs in this way would go bankrupt."

SMEAR TACTICS

In April 1965, another announcement issued from urban renewal headquarters. Surprise. The $100,000 feasibility study showed that the Kendall Square site was an eligible urban renewal area. So $401,200 more was funneled out to begin survey and planning activities. Now a tax-fed smear of Kendall Square was a simple matter. Owners complained that urban renewal investigators tried to muscle their way into buildings with city fire inspectors to look for defects in order to make the area appear decadent. One owner discovered a photographer on his property attempting to get an unfavorable angle on a warehouse behind his parking lot.

The going was to get even rougher. During congressional testimony, Housing and Home Finance chieftain Robert Weaver dropped the remark that if NASA didn't get the center in Kendall Square "they will not do it in Massachusetts at all." Protesting businessmen suddenly discovered that friends and colleagues considered them unpatriotic and selfish for standing in the way of the space program.

MOMENT OF TRUTH

Finally, on August 30, a public hearing on the urban renewal plan was held in the Cambridge City Council Building. Just days before, NASA unveiled a model of the center's 26-story building, and one newspaper reported that space officials beamed like players on a winning football team. Then, at the meeting, ERC Deputy Director Albert Kelley, leading off for NASA, delivered the familiar sales pitch: the center would create at least $450 million of induced income in the area over the next 10 years.

Dr. Brennan arose. "Our companies exist now," he replied. Nathan Matz, president of Automotive Warehouse, stood up. "Not one of you has ever visited us," he told the council. "No one has taken the time to come in and see what this is all about."

Then an outraged citizen, John L. Warden, spoke: "Fixing up neighborhoods is one thing. But destroying the property of one person so that another may have it for his own use is immoral, unconstitutional, and detrimental to our city. If this sort of program is allowed, it will not stop until people who want to build new buildings at the public expense have taken every acre they happen to desire."

Minutes later, the council voted 6 to 3 in favor of the urban renewal plan. Another community had succumbed to the lure of the Federal dollar—and the space age. A month passed, and the property owners, vowing to take their case to the courts, made one last presentation to the Division of Urban Renewal of the Massachusetts Department of Commerce and Development, which must pass on all urban renewal plans. This agency held a hearing, but on the same day word was let out by urban renewal officials in Washington that Cambridge had received approval of $15,330,000 for the Kendall Square project. The onrushing Federal bureaucracy had not even bothered to wait for the State's rubber stamp. (The State agency approved the plan on October 8, and the Kendall Square property owners have gone to court.)

"This approval," proclaimed the Urban Renewal Administration, "will permit the start of land acquisition, relocation of site occupants, and site clearance and preparation."

Then came these words: "The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has expressed interest in building a new space center in the major part of the area."

Surely that will go down as the understatement of the year.

---

[2] The project's price tag had already risen by $10 million.

[3] MIT had already said it would be willing to help develop the other 13 acres set aside for private (nonindustrial) use.

Price Notice Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a price notice bill, to require companies in basic industries to give notice to the President of any proposed price increase, and to require a 60-day waiting period prior to the effective date of the price increase.

My bill would give both industry and Government time to review fully results that are likely to flow from a proposed price increase in a basic industry. It will provide a forum in which private interests and officials charged with Government responsibilities can have freedom to act.

Four times in the last 3 years the President of the United States has been confronted with announcements that companies in industries basic to the well-being of the entire economy were going to raise prices, in the face of and notwithstanding the concern of the President's economic advisers that excessive inflationary pressures necessarily would result. In 1962, the steel industry proposed such a price rise, and in 1965 the aluminum and copper industries tried to increase prices in an inflationary manner. In 1966, elements of the steel industry wanted a price hike in structural steel, which according to the President's economic advisers, would have been inflationary, and injurious to the economy. In each instance the President has had his busy schedule abruptly disorganized, and has had to resort to vigorous action to safeguard the interests of all of the people.

Such confrontations between the President and industry are undesirable, destructive, and are incompatible with orderly Government-business relationships.

The bill that I am sponsoring will accomplish the following:

First. Provide a method to identify basic industries in which the private pricing action of one firm is of nationwide concern and is contrary to the interests of the public to avoid inflation. One standard relates total industry sales to the gross national product. Information needed to establish the precise percentage relationship on an informed basis will be secured during the hearings on the bill.

Second. Afford a waiting period, prior to the effectiveness of such a price increase, during which time the forces of both sides can take the matter to the public, and explore likely results of the proposed price increase. During the waiting period, if appropriate to the circumstances, hearings could be held by interested congressional committees.

Third. Panic buying of articles affected by proposed price increases would be avoided. After the completion of the waiting period, the price increase would be retroactive to the date of announcement.

Fourth. Maximum freedom from direct Government interference in the private sectors of the economy is retained. The Government would not establish mandatory price ceilings or direct price controls. If the Government is unsuccessful in its efforts to cause a recision, the proposed price increase would be effective at the end of the waiting period.

Fifth. Administrative problems that attend direct Government regulation, and expenditures that would be involved in the establishment of a new Government agency, are avoided.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11870

A bill to amend the Sherman Act, as amended, by requiring prior notification of price increases in certain industries, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Development of the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States in certain basic industries has resulted in an undue concentration of economic power. Pricing actions of individual companies in basic industries have a direct effect on the public interest, and may be detrimental to the general public welfare. It is the intent of Congress in this Act to provide a method for private interests to be coordinated with the responsibilities of the Government in the pricing of goods and services in such basic industries.

Section 1. The Act of July 2, 1890, as amended, commonly referred to as the Sherman Antitrust Act (15 U.S.C. 1, et seq.) is amended by adding a new section, to be section 9 thereof, as follows:

"Sec. 9. No person in the industries designated in this section 9, or to be designated by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of this section 9, shall increase the price of goods or services manufactured or supplied by such person until 60 days after delivery to the Government official designated by the President of notice of the proposed price increase. Such notice shall include: (1) the name and address of the person making the price increase, (2) the basic industry in which such person does business, and (3) the goods or services involved in the price increase. During said 60 days, the President may take such action as he determines to be appropriate. Unless the notice is withdrawn prior to the termination of said 60 days, the price increase that was the subject of such notice shall be effective as of the date the notice was delivered.

"Within 60 days after enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Commerce shall publish in the Federal Register a list of the basic industries that are subject to the provisions of this Act. The basic industries that are subject to the provisions of this Act are the steel industry, the aluminum industry, the petroleum refining industry, the copper industry, and the automobile industry, and such additional industries that are designated after the Secretary of Commerce finds there is compliance with the following:

"(1) Industries in which the combined sales of the four largest persons amounts to 75 per centum or more of aggregate sales in the industry, and aggregate sales in the industry amount to — per centum of the Gross National Product, or

"(2) Goods or services produced in the industry are included in the list of strategic and critical materials pursuant to the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act (50 U.S.C. 98, et seq.), and

"(3) Such additional standards as may be established by the President.

"The provisions of this section 9 shall not apply in any industry in which the price of goods and services is subject to direct control by an agency of the United States."

Sec. 2. This Act shall be effective on and after 60 days after the date of enactment.

Averell Harriman: The Man for All Seasons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following very interesting article which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 3, 1966, with reference to Ambassador Averell Harriman, a distinguished American who has unselfishly served his country for many years and who continues to serve now at a time in his life when other men would have laid aside the heavy burdens of public office. He is an elder statesman who is held in the highest respect throughout the world. He has accepted every challenging assignment offered to him without thought of personal considerations.

Ambassador Harriman served the great State of New York as Governor and has held numerous high diplomatic and Government posts. We are fortunate, indeed, to have available at this difficult period in our history a man of Ambassador Harriman's background, integrity and ability. It is my hope that God will grant him the strength to serve for many more years to come.

An Observer's Opinion—Ave: A Real Man on a Man's Errand

(By William S. White)

Washington.—No matter where the pendulum of fate may at last come to rest in Vietnam—whether fixedly pointed to an honorable peace or to the flames of a larger war—the new year finds one of the old boys showing the young how duty is done at the center of the crisis.

Averell Harriman, at 74 an elderly party by a chronological test, is putting one of this country's dearest cliche-myths, the cult of youth worship, to a severe test.

The most roving of all our roving ambassadors, he was more or less endlessly airborne at the approach of the new year. In his somewhat dull but absolutely tireless and determined way, he was carrying climactic messages from President Johnson to national leaders half around the world in America's final spasm of effort to reach a decent and nonappeasing peace to end the Vietnamese war.

His journeys then would have exhausted most men of half his years. And beyond doubt there will be many other journeys before this curiously ageless man lays down at last a public career that began before many of his diplomatic colleagues had put on their first long pants.

His highest professional qualification is his record as President Truman's Ambassador to the Soviet Union, now a long time ago. In Moscow he became the first Western envoy totally to sense—and to report back home with no trimming—that a thing we now call the cold war was about to be opened by the Communist world.

But his highest human qualification is something else. His very age is the strength of his career. For alone among current high officials he cannot possibly be suspected, by the most suspicious associate or by Congress, of allowing personal ambition to color or to frighten in the smallest way his work or his recommendations.

So it is that all Washington knows one thing at least—that if he says something he believes it, purely and simply. He is not running for anything.

He is a man, this Harriman, who was twice cruelly disappointed in politics. The first time was when he was denied the presidential nomination that Harry Truman had earnestly sought for him. The second time was when Nelson Rockefeller unseated him as Governor of New York.

Many would have curled up and quit when the last and unsuspected blow had fallen. Harriman, instead, stolidly came here to work in the State Department, in his grumpily quiet way, for President John F. Kennedy.

He was a poor politician. His speeches, howeven written, were unconquerably pedestrian in his mouth, and in affectionate impatience he evoked the nickname of "Honest Ave, the Hair Splitter." For elective office, the knack was simply not in him. He became instead a most superior public official of the appointive sort. He had, in spite of himself, found his place. This is perhaps why he is able to show the younger men how duty is at last done.

Averell Harriman is a good type to have around when the heat is on and they need a man for a man's errand.

The Peace Corps and Protest Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, an article of an alarming nature came to my attention. The article concerns the Peace Corps and the recent student protest demonstrations on banning the bomb, integrating Mississippi into the United States as they refer to it, abolishing the State Department, or turning the Metropolitan Opera House over to folksingers. This article may not have been so disturbing had it not been for one detail—it appeared in the Peace Corps News, a semiofficial publication of the Peace Corps itself.

The Peace Corps News is published twice a year by the Peace Corps in cooperation with the U.S. Student Press Association, an arm of the leftwing U.S. National Student Association, and the Associated College Press. This publication purports to reach more than 1 million students through the Nation's college newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to request unanimous consent that this article to which I have referred be included in the RECORD, for I dislike making it a part of the history of this body. However, knowing no other way that the text of the article may be conveyed to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD:

SITINS BORING? TRY PEACE CORPS

Have you been arrested five times in the last 5 months for sitting in?

Do you think we should ban the bomb, integrate Mississippi into the United States, abolish, the State Department and turn the Met over to folksingers?

The Peace Corps is just your cup of espresso.

Once you can sneak through the glorified college boards they use for selection (forge some good references and tell them you're from Berkeley and you're in), and endure the glorified Boy Scout training program (be stoic), you're on your own, free to foment ferment and to organize community spirit to build ever higher standards of living and topple imperialists.

There's no business like revolution to stir your blood, give you experience in fighting injustice, round out your education (the educated man simply must know how to debeak chickens) and alienate the establishment.

It's the way out of every identity crisis (and if you aren't having an identity crisis, the Peace Corps doesn't want you), the road to unification of the world behind a program of eradicating evil.

What have you got to lose but your anonymity?

Independence Day of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in calling to the attention of this Congress the 11th of January, which marks the national holiday of the Republic of Chad. This former colony of France achieved its independence on August 11, 1960, but proclaimed January 11 as its national holiday.

On this occasion, we wish to extend warm and personal felicitations to His Excellency Francois Tombalbaye, the President of the Republic of Chad; and to His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, Chad's Ambassador to the United States.

It is fitting that the hearty and industrious people of Chad should adopt "Unity, Work, Progress" as their motto. Since gaining their independence, they have kept these goals clearly in mind, and have constantly striven to make them a reality.

The Republic of Chad is the largest of the former French Equatorial African countries, more than twice the size of France. Its population, estimated at close to 3 million, is divided roughly into two main parts. The segment in the north is mostly Arabized while the group in the south is largely animist in religion but with Christians among the leaders.

Little has been written on the early history of Chad. Europeans did not begin exploring the region until the early 19th century, and at that time the trade in slaves was being carried on in various parts of the region. During the period when France was engaged in various military campaigns in west Africa, Chad was viewed as an area of great strategic importance. As a result, it was organized as a French military base area in 1900.

Chad became an administrative territory of the Federation of French Equatorial Africa in 1913. In the early stages of World War II, Chad was the first of the French territories in Africa to rally to the support of the Free French, and served as a supply base for Allied operations in East Africa and the Mediterranean.

The year 1946 saw increased autonomy and French citizenship conferred on Chad and other dependencies. The enabling act of 1956 and constitutional referendum of September 1, 1958, set the basic framework for full Chadian independence and membership in the French Community in 1960.

Chad's economy, which is agricultural, has two strong pillars: cotton and stock raising. Cotton is the principal money crop and accounts for approximately 80 percent of Chad's exports. During 1964 imports were up 15 percent while exports increased by 11 percent. France continues to be the leading customer and supplier, although trade with the U.S.A. has also seen a steady increase.

Chad's landlocked position has thus far proved to be a major handicap in overcoming some of her economic difficulties. This has resulted in the Government's placing highest priority on a rail link to the sea via Cameroon.

Judging from the facts I have mentioned, it would appear that Chad is well underway in its quest for "Unity, Work, Progress." Her friends in the Congress and the American people as a whole extend best wishes and congratulations to the Republic of Chad, her Government, and her hardworking people on their national independence day.

Servicemen Should Be Able To Mail Gifts From Combat Zones Duty Free to Their Families in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to liberalize the dollar limitation on gifts which can be mailed duty free from foreign countries into the United States. I have drafted this legislation to apply specifically to our servicemen in combat areas because I know that some of the families of servicemen had to pay customs duties on gifts which they received from Vietnam last Christmas. I had one specific instance brought to my attention. I know there must be others.

An editorial in the Junction City (Kans.) Daily Union on Wednesday, November 24, called attention to the fact that the wife of a Fort Riley soldier, now in Vietnam, received a shipment of Christmas gifts from her husband on which she was required to pay customs duties. The editorial writer was upset, as well he should have been, and I became upset myself when I learned all of the details in a letter from the wife of the serviceman involved.

She received a Christmas package from her husband with two sweaters and a camera for her two daughters and herself. She had to pay a 42½-percent duty on the sweaters and a 15-percent duty on the camera. All told, it cost her $10.81 in customs duties before the mailman would release the gifts.

This is definitely not right. I have no argument with the imposition of customs duties on foreign imports, but I certainly think we should make an exception when it comes to the gifts which servicemen send home from combat zones.

Most of the time these men must buy the gifts whenever they have a free moment. Their shopping is usually limited to the PX and they have to purchase what is available and not give too much thought to the customs duties.

Gifts valued under $10 can be mailed from foreign countries under present regulations as long as not more than one gift is sent to any one person in any one day. This is all well and good for tourists who can take the time to be selective and can make separate mailings. It does not help a serviceman though, who has to make his purchases at one time and mail them in one package.

The bill I have introduced would increase this $10 limitation to $50 and it would apply only to servicemen in combat zones as designated by the President. I think the $50 figure is a realistic one and will cover most of the gift purchases which servicemen make for their families at Christmas time or whenever there are birthdays and anniversaries to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, this is a little thing, but it will mean a great deal to the members of the Armed Forces and their families. I would hope that hearings could be scheduled on this legislation right away. I am certain that the testimony will bear out the soundness of making this special concession for these people. I would hope that this change could be made so that another Christmas would not pass without making some provision for servicemen to send home duty free gifts on a basis which is reasonable and just.

Eighty Years of Happy Marriage for Pioneer Sholbergs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last week to send a telegram of greetings and congratulations to a couple in my congressional district who celebrated their 80th wedding anniversary on January 5. These remarkable people are Mr. and Mrs. Ole Sholberg, of Fergus Falls, Minn., who represent the strength of the pioneering spirit that made this Nation so great.

The Associated Press carried a wire story on the remarkable accomplishments of the centenarian Sholbergs, and I would like to share these observations with you.

Centenarians To Observe 80th Wedding Anniversary

Fergus Falls, Minn.—Ole Sholberg, 103, and his little wife, Otila, 101, who live contentedly while 'waiting for the Lord to call us," will observe their 80th wedding anniversary Wednesday.

"We have never had an serious quarrel," said Mrs. Sholberg in a soft voice. "He has been a good man, and we have had a happy life. We still have a happy life."

Ole sat with his arm around Otila. He tried to smile but the attrition of his years made it difficult. His wife caressed his hand, and smiled for both of them.

HARD WORKERS

Sholberg has poor hearing and vision. His face is strong, marbled by the winter spray of the North Sea where as a boy in Norway he helped his father fish. There are lines too which somehow tell how he, as a frontier husband and father in western Minnesota, shielded his family from blizzards and forest fires.

Families of the couple came to the United States 2 years apart. Sholberg's from near Kristiansund and Otila's from near Skarnes.

As a boy of 15, Ole customarily walked 16 miles day a to get the mail. One day he found a short cut, which took him past a country home where Otila Hill was picking wild flowers. On his way back home with the mail, Ole mustered courage to go to the house and ask for a drink of water.

"It seemed that Ole got very thirsty," his wife recalled. "He came back again."

BUILT PIONEER HOMES

On January 5, 1886, 7 years after their first meeting, the two were married in the Hills' farm home. Sholberg borrowed $100 as the down payment on a farm and hauled 60 loads of hay into town the first summer to pay for the lumber he used to build his first two-room home. Ole was a good carpenter, and he helped build many other pioneer homes.

The Sholbergs' six daughters and two sons will be with the old couple to help observe the anniversary. They will include Julius, of Elizabeth, Minn., who celebrated his 55th wedding anniversary last year.

On January 9, sitting in their tidy Fergus Falls home which Ole built when he was 80, the couple will listen by radio to a special church service at Bethlehem Lutheran Church, another building which Ole helped build. The service will be dedicated to the Sholbergs and letters of congratulations, including one from President Lyndon Johnson, will be read. Otila said she will repeat for Ole any parts of the service he is unable to hear.

LIVE WITH CHILDREN

Two of their children, Clara and the widowed Mrs. Frank Meder, live with the Sholbergs. Sholberg has never spent a day in a hospital. He and his wife get along on social security payments, and relatives say, the couple has never thought about asking for public assistance.

Mrs. Sholberg about in a wheelchair and can walk by holding onto things. She spends her time reading the Bible, daily devotionals and a Norwegian language newspaper.

Her husband sleeps most of the time but comes to the table for all his meals.

The Reverend Otto Dale, their pastor, says the Sholbergs are not afraid of death.

"They have had a long and glorious life," the Lutheran minister added. "They have given something good and lasting to this country. They are the people on whom this country was built.

"They have a beautiful marriage."

Dividends From Korea—Nation's Aid in Viet War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, an excellent article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, 1966:

Dividends From Korea—Nation's Aid in Viet War

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Washington.—It is 13 years since the nightmare of the Korean war. And what did it all mean?

Was it wasted strife or incalculable boon? What is the answer from South Korea today?

The answer is that the American people can be proud of what the United States did for South Korea and has reason to be grateful for what South Korea has done for itself.

This is the record:

With the help of a dozen other nations, but primarily on its own, the United States turned back the aggression to the 38th parallel which divided the two Koreas.

Today, South Korea is secure, tranquil, and progressive.

It has a democratic government ruling by the consent of the governed.

It is carrying forward significant social reforms.

It is stable—so stable that, despite some demonstrations, it was able last year to establish diplomatic relations with its once hated enemy and occupier, Japan, which is now providing it with $800 million in grants and loans over a 10-year period.

South Korea is proving itself resourceful and increasingly self-reliant. It is making steady economic progress and, while U.S. aid has been substantial, the South Koreans have been showing what self-help can really be. Their gross national product has been rising at the rate of about 8 percent a year; industrial production is up 15 percent.

Grievously short of land to enable its people to be self-sufficient in food, the government of Chung Hee Park, by literally carving terraces out of mountains, is doubling its arable land.

South Korean industry is making rapid strides. Exports are up from $20 million in 1959 to $170 million today.

But this is only half of it. These are some of the things South Korea has been doing for itself. These are the ways South Korea has been using its security from aggression.

And now what is the other dividend besides a free people secured from oppression? What is the earned dividend, which has not been asked, but which is now so welcome and so helpful?

South Korea's dividend to the United States is in South Vietnam today.

Defended against Communist aggression by the United States, South Korea is today helping the United States repel the Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

Not just with truck drivers and medical supplies and behind-the-lines support.

But with 15,000 battle-hardened South Korea freedom fighters trained for action in the jungles and rice paddies where the Vietcong are deadliest—plus 2,000 combat engineers.

Little South Korea, with a population of 28 million, is doing far more than any

68 208 AA A 30

other country except the United States and is contributing more fighting men per capita than even the United States.

And why did the Government and Parliament of South Korea make this tremendous decision to commit 17,000 men to the defense of South Vietnam?

They know from their own experiences the crucial need to defeat aggression in South Vietnam—and are doing what they can to help.

Neighborhood Youth Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following resolution adopted by the Michigan State Board of Education, under date of September 24, 1965:

Resolution adopted by the Michigan Curriculum Committee on School Holding Power on September 24, 1965, requesting the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the Members of Congress from this State to increase the number of available training spaces to a number sufficient to meet the purposes for which the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was conceived.

Whereas the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was approved by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of breaking the cycle of poverty; and

Whereas the Neighborhood Youth Corps was created as a result of this act to give financial assistance to youth to stay in school and to give needed work experience to youth who have left school; and

Whereas the developing evidence indicates that this program has already achieved a degree of success; and

Whereas an ever-increasing number of youth were being involved; and

Whereas a retrenchment in an on-going program to which the Federal Government has already committed itself can only cause confusion and resentment on the part of the youth and the community; and

Whereas it will be difficult to replace staff laid off as a result of cutbacks should the program be increased in the future; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Labor has seen fit to reduce the number of training spaces available to present on-going programs for in-school and out-of-school youth in Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Michigan Curriculum Committee on School Holding Power hereby goes on record as favoring the provision for an adequate number of training spaces for both in-school and out-of-school youth who can benefit from them; and Be it further

Resolved, That the Michigan Curriculum Committee on School Holding Power requests the Michigan State Board of Education to use its good offices with the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity, the U.S. Department of Labor and the Members of Congress from the State to increase the number of available training spaces to a number sufficient to meet the purposes for which the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was conceived.

Salute to Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the 10th aniversary of her independence. As you are aware, the 2d session of the 89th Congress had not yet convened. However, I did not want the opportunity overlooked to extend to the people and the Government of Sudan the warmest felicitations of this country on this occasion. Congratulations are therefore extended on this occasion to His Excellency Ismail el Ezhari, the President of the Supreme Council of State; and to His Excellency Abbash el Obeid, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

Traditionally, most Americans anxiously await the end of an old year and look forward to the approach of the new year in anticipation of prosperity, progress, and peace. But January 1 has even more significance to the people of the Republic of the Sudan.

It was on this date in 1956 that this huge country was proclaimed an independent and soverign state. Comprising an area almost one-tenth of the African continent, this young and dynamic Republic is a land of more than 12 million inhabitants.

However, it should be noted that while the Sudan is celebrating its 10th anniversary as an independent Republic, its historical legacy goes back very far indeed. Ancient Egyptian inscriptions and references in the Old Testament—to the Land of Kush—bear evidence of the Sudan's past greatness. During most of the 19th century, the Sudan was under Turkish-Egyptian subjugation with a short period of independence between 1885 and 1899. Following the joint British-Egyptian reconquest of the country in 1896–98, a new governmental system had to be devised. This resulted in joint Anglo-Egyptian administration or condominium, as the system was called.

The Sudan is a land of sharp contrasts, divided between the economically developed Moslem North and the largely pagan and Christian underdeveloped South. However, strong efforts are being made to overcome these and other handicaps.

Sudan's somewhat small and scattered population and lack of known resources has forced the country's economy to remain primarily an agricultural one. Cotton is the mainstay of the Sudanese economy, and accounts for approximately 70 percent of the country's total exports and about 30 percent of the total world production of the long staple variety. The Gezira scheme, which developed a large portion of the south to relative wealth, has proved itself a model of agricultural achievement which other undeveloped areas conceivably could adopt. Extensive irrigation could increase the chances for an even more diversified economy. Liberal foreign trade policies have aided in stimulating Sudan's exports and imports. Its world trade balance is satisfactory and foreign exchange reserves have steadily grown to over $150 million. Annual capital formation is at approximately 10 percent and development investments are growing at a rate of more than 8 percent of the gross national product, which has been estimated at $900 million.

Internal problems have not prevented the Sudan from taking an active part in international affairs, as its membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa has demonstrated; in addition, the Sudan is an important member in such organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, and the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Though the Sudan has been experiencing what one might call growing pains there is little doubt as to the resolution and determination of this large and friendly country to meet the challenges and overcome the difficulties which beset it.

I am certain that the entire American people join me in extending warm and sincere congratulations on this, the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Sudan.

Hon. Myron Cowen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Cowen was my good and close friend for more than 25 years. He was an outstanding diplomat and served his country with great distinction as Ambassador to the Philippines, Australia, and Belgium. He was also widely known in legal and business circles. Ambassador Cowen's passing is a great loss not only to his family but to his many friends who were privileged to know him over the years and who profited by his wise counsel and experienced views. I mourn the loss of an old and dear friend.

[From the New York World Telegram & Sun, Nov. 4, 1965]

MYRON COWEN

Fifteen years ago the Communist Huks in the Philippines were starting off about as menacingly as did the Vietcong subsequently in South Vietnam. And financial problems in the Philippines were even more troublesome.

But America, and the anti-Communist Western World, were fortunate to have as U.S. Ambassador in Manila a skilled diplomat and businessman, Myron M. Cowen. Working closely with President Elpidio Quirino and Defense Minister Ramon Magsaysay, Mr. Cowen lent a most effective hand in helping to solve both problems. The eminent Philippines stature in Asia today stems from surmounting those crises of 1950.

Mr. Cowen's death Monday night at 67, in Washington, will be widely mourned. His illustrious career included ambassadorships also in Australia and Belgium. He distinguished himself as a diplomat, lawyer, and businessman of consistent achievement.

Americans Have Not Been Told About Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an editorial entitled "Americans Have Not Been Told About Communism," published in the St. John News of St. John, Kans. It seems to me that the editor, Clelland Cole, makes a very important point in his editorial about the lack of information furnished our people about why we are in Vietnam and the ultimate result which we expect. The editorial follows:

AMERICANS HAVE NOT BEEN TOLD ABOUT COMMUNISM

President Lyndon Johnson and his mighty machine evidently became so engrossed in powering an avalanche of new programs through the last session of Congress that they forgot to explain to the American people our reason for being involved in the war in Vietnam.

As a result there is a national apathy, and hardly one person in a thousand understands that we have any valid reason for the war; ask the next hundred persons you meet and see if any of them can really explain why it is mandatory that we stay in that war—and that we win it.

The American people simply have not been advised. There has been no particular political appeal, and no building of an image in the grisly business of explaining why we are pouring men into an angry meat grinder away off on the other side of the world, so that today there is bewilderment, anxiety, frustration, bitterness, and a seething sea of misunderstanding, plus a lack of knowledge.

Why are we in Vietnam?

If we were ever to finally take a stand against total world communism, it had to be taken, but the American people have not been told. They have not been told that the Communist program of absorption, envelopment, and adoption has been, and is, moving ahead steadily, relentlessly, and that the Communist program by which schools, churches, cities, and nations, are enveloped leaves but few opportunities for challenge. The challenge was made in Vietnam. Should that area be lost, Asia is lost. Should Asia be lost, South America is almost certain to be lost. Africa has been lost for years. Should South America be lost, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States would be sitting ducks. And if the Vietnam struggle is continued long enough so that Red China can mount a formidable nuclear attack, America's peril would be too ghastly to even consider.

But America has not been told. Evidently L.B.J. and McNamara underestimated the power of the Vietcong and thought the brush fire could be stomped out at will, or they refused to take the American people into their confidence to the point of telling the stark and shocking truth.

If America had been told, if all the high-sounding spending programs had been chucked so that we could get on with winning the war—if Americans were told how effectively the Communists are moving against us, within our borders and without—today there would be less draft card burning, less public apathy, less resistance, and a public patriotism which would place the Communists, the radicals, the demonstrators, the beatniks, and Red sympathizers in their proper perspective.

We are in a wicked, desperate, terrible war.

We cannot win it on a manpower basis.

We cannot win it and carry on public squandering at home with a business as usual attitude in Washington and across the Nation.

Should we make the horrible mistake of letting it drag out until such time as Red China builds an effective nuclear arsenal, we have led ourselves and whatever friends we have left into the certainty of atomic warfare.

Political analysts, commentators of high repute, all agree now that for all his acumen in driving his will through Congress, L. B. J. has almost a total inability to cope with vast foreign problems. This, coupled with his failure to explain, frankly and honestly, the reasons back of the Vietnam war and the absolute need for winning it if freedom is to survive, has led to the pathetic public bewilderment today.

If we don't get ourselves united in this war effort quickly, tragedy of the most terrible proportions could greet us on the mofrow.

L.B.J.'s Funny Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker the appearance last fall of Lyndon Johnson's funny money prompted the following timely verse by Charlie Gebhard in his "Nowadaze" column in the Waverly (Iowa) Democrat:

WE'VE BEEN SLUGGED

Now listen, friends, and you shall hear
Just why I'm crying in my beer.
It really is a tale of woe
That started many years ago.

My dad worked hard and saved his cash,
And taught me not to do things rash.
He said, "Now, son, please stay awake
And wooden nickels do not take."

I shunned the poolhalls in my youth
And booze and dames and things uncouth;
Yes, I was prudent all my life
And found myself a thrifty wife.

We worked together, side by each,
Till wealth was nearly in our reach.
But then there came the fateful day;
That "two-bit move" by L.B.J.

For coins he ruled that silver's out
And copper slugs he's spread about.
He says they're just as good as gold;
Farewell to honest coins of old.

Now I recall my father's words:
"Wooden nickels are for the birds."
New copper slugs seem worthless, too,
But what are you and I to do?

The day of reckoning is here;
That's why I'm crying in my beer.
Life's no longer milk and honey—
Here we are with funny money.

Coast Guard Helicopter Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WENDELL WYATT
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, immediately before Christmas the Coast Guard helicopter unit stationed near the mouth of the Columbia River, at Astoria, Oreg., proved once again conclusively the value and wisdom in establishing this squadron at this location.

Six people are living today who would certainly be dead were it not for the prompt, efficient, and heroic reaction of the Coast Guard helicopter squadron commanded by Comdr. Robert Lawlis.

A helicopter flying from the Shell Oil Co. exploratory ship off the Oregon coast experienced a loss of power and was forced to ditch approximately 1 mile west of Seaside, Oreg., and the six men aboard were soon in the water clinging to the floats of the lost helicopter. The temperature in the water was between 30 and 40°.

When the Coast Guard was alerted, surface vessels and the helicopter from Astoria were at once dispatched and within a very short period of time the helicopter located the six men. Four were immediately hoisted aboard and taken to the Seaside Hospital and the other two were saved within 20 minutes.

The survivors estimated that two of them would not have lasted in the water for more than 5 minutes and that the remaining four probably could not have survived for more than 20 additional minutes. Surface vessels certainly would not have located them within this time.

The rescue helicopter was commanded by Lt. Comdr. Robert Burns and piloted by Chief Aviation Pilot Clyde M. Causley. All of the rescued survived without serious aftereffects.

I would like to emphasize that these are not the first lives saved by this great squadron but this is the largest number saved at any one time and certainly the most dramatic rescue. This emphasizes the arguments made prior to the location of the helicopter squadron at the mouth of the Columbia River, and certainly if the squadron had engaged in no other activity since its formation, this one rescue would have justified its existence.

Likewise, I am pleased to point out that the Coast Guard command has heretofore pressed for and secured authority to erect a permanent hangar at the Clatsop County Airport which is even nearer than the present base of the helicopters near the town of Astoria itself.

This squadron presently has two helicopters and in normal course of events one helicopter is apt to be engaged operationally and it is always possible that one may be on the ground for repairs or normal maintenance.

It would seem to me that the proved effectiveness of this squadron would strongly justify the assignment of more helicopters to the squadron which has done such an outstanding job in search and rescue during the past many months.

We in Oregon salute Commander Lawlis, Commander Burns, Chief Causley, and all members of this fine Coast Guard unit in Astoria.

Letters From Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two very interesting letters written from Korea by Jerome I. Udell, director of the Bank of North America, during a 2-month period while he was on an assignment to advise the Korea Trade Promotion Corp. in connection with their program to increase exports:

JULY 22, 1965.

DEAR ——: Here we are in Seoul, Korea, 3 weeks and 11,000 miles away from New York. In case you didn't know, or don't remember, I came here on a 2-month assignment to advise the Korea Trade Promotion Corp. in its program designed to increase exports.

We came by way of Tokyo and learned, to our disappointment, that in the past 8 years since we were last there, Tokyo has lost a great deal of its Far Eastern quaintness and is being westernized at much too fast a rate including a plethora of automobiles.

From the time our plane set down in Seoul and we were garlanded with beautiful flowers, life here has been delightful and busy. I find myself saying often—"Home was never like this." Thanks to our friend, Mickey Most, and his wife, Eleanor, there was very little for us to arrange. We were immediately quartered in a lovely spacious house next to them on the Army post. They had engaged a cook/maid for us and I must blush when I say that the monthly stipend is 5,000 won, or a little less than $20. She sleeps in, cooks, cleans and even polishes my shoes, hands me my raincoat, umbrella and rubbers as I leave. I mention these because within 1 week of our arrival, we have had a steady downpour with brief, sunny interludes.

Unfortunately, the rains became so steady and heavy that the Han River overran its banks. It is reported that here in Seoul and throughout the rest of South Korea, 182,000 people had to flee from their homes and a couple of hundred were lost. Everything possible is being done for the homeless. It seems unreal that within a few miles of where we live, there could be so much suffering. The heavy rains have now ended.

As you can surmise, the cost of living here is unbelievably low whether we buy on the Korean economy or from the wonderful Army post exchange and commissary where adequate types of American foods or commodities are available. Dry cleaning a pair of pants costs 30 cents but, if you should think that is too high, it is probably due to the fact that they pick up and deliver. One can't help being struck by the remarkable efficiency with which the Army takes care of everything from water purification to supplying a car and chauffeur for official business.

Unlike Tokyo, Seoul is completely oriental and fascinating.

Last Sunday we drove about 100 miles south in the Most car through rural areas, visited a model village and a pilot hill-terracing program, and then attended a conference of Korean businessmen at Onyang at which Mickey spoke.

On the way down we saw endless miles of rice paddies with the farmers lined up, sometimes as many as 20 or 30 in a row, doubled over and ankle deep in water, planting rice seedlings. They were working when we went south and were still working at dusk when we went north. What is more, they were working at feverish speed in order to make up for the time lost during the 60-day record, long, drought. We were told that the whole community pitches in and takes one rice paddy at a time until all have been finished. In some cases, the Korean soldiers help to take advantage of the long-awaited rain.

The Koreans are energetic, bright, extremely affable, and clean. Thanks to the Agency for International Development (AID), the industrialization process is growing apace. In 1964 the exports reached $120 million after starting several years ago from close to zero. The goal this year is $170 million and, judging from the first 6 months, they will meet this goal and possibly exceed it.

We had dinner at a Korean home with the kind of setting of which you have no doubt heard. There were 20 courses and we sat on the floor. There was no sign of our host's wife. When we were leaving the host explained that she was not at home—I guess because he was conscious of the fact that we do things differently in our culture. Maybe theirs is a better system. After two oriental meals—sukiyaki and Korean—I am positive I will never learn to like that kind of food.

The National Assembly has just opened. The Democratic Republican Party, which has a great majority, is advocating the normalization treaty with Japan. The Koreans have good reasons to mistrust and dislike the Japanese who ruled here with an iron hand from 1910 to 1945 and found many ways of humiliating the Koreans. In the first session, the Minjung, the minority party, which opposes the treaty with Japan, mounted the rostrum and a free-for-all melee followed. Sophie wanted to attend a session but our Embassy strongly frowns on any American visiting the National Assembly.

Let me hasten to reassure you that I do not plan to write a book on Korea, but I thought that these few comments would be interesting to you. Our AID program has certainly proven itself and is continuing to prove itself here. In Taiwan, where the program has run for many years, they have finally reached the point where they can do without any further American aid.

I hope that this finds you in good health and enjoying the summer. It would be a real pleasure to receive a letter or even a postcard from you at the address below. All the best.

Sincerely,

JEROME I. UDELL,
ED/PE USOM/Korea.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
November 1965.

A SECOND LETTER FROM KOREA

Korea is now behind us. You will recall that I was sent there by the U.S. State Department's Agency for International Development (AID) to advise the Korean Minister of Commerce and Industry in connection with the operations of the Korean Trade Promotion Corp. (Kotra) and its effort to increase Korean exports. After spending 12 weeks in Korea, mostly in Seoul, a city of 3 million people, we learned a little about the country. This second letter from Korea is inspired by the numerous requests for additional information that followed the first and by my preference for writing rather than talking about our experiences. This can be read at your leisure, if you wish to. Make allowances for the fact that I was afflicted, as are many others, with the tendency to become highly protagonistic in similar circumstances. Many of the thoughts are Sophie's.

There seems to be a widespread haziness about Korea, a haziness in which I shared until I went there. Many have posed such questions to me as—"So you speak Chinese now?" or "How did you enjoy Vietnam?" or "Tell me about your stay in Japan." Most people don't know that Korea is a peninsula bordered on the north by Manchuria and Siberia and separated by seas on its east from Japan and on its west from Red China.

Little is known about the antiquity of the Koreans, except that their origins seem to be similar to that of the Japanese. Their language is their own, known as Hongul, for which one of the rulers had some learned men create a special alphabet. Korea previously was called Chosun, which means "Land of the morning calm." The country was many times the victim of attacks by neighboring countries, with the result that it adopted a policy of rigid seclusion and became known as the hermit kingdom. It was invaded in the 12th century by the Chinese, who established a loose suzerainty. Thereafter, under native kings Korea developed a high degree of civilization. For 1,300 years they were ruled successively by the Silla, Koroyo, and Yi dynasties.

We had the pleasure of meeting one of the last living male descendants of the Yi family. At one time called prince but now known as Mr. Ku Yi, he is an architect graduated from M.I.T. and is married to a delightful, bright American woman. The Government has provided quarters for them in a building on the grounds of an old palace, but they don't have the comforts of a USOM home. The Ku Yi's lived in the States but with the incapacitation of his father he returned to Korea as head of the family, in keeping with Korean tradition.

Korea never emerged, as Japan did, in the mid-19th century. Nor did it have a chance to emerge in this century because it was part of and under the domination of the Japanese Empire from 1910 to 1945. It is only since the end of World War II in 1945, and realistically since the end of the Korean civil war in 1953, during which the whole country was tragically devastated, that we have begun to learn more and more about the country. For those who want to know more about Korea and its people, I recommend reading a book which I found interesting, Pearl Buck's "Living Reed," depicting so well the life in Korea and the struggle for independence. Korean names represent a peculiarity of the nation. It is said that if you drop an object from a window anywhere in Korea it would land three times out of four on a Lee, a Kim or a Park. Lee, by the way, can be spelled Li, Yi or Rhee; Park can likewise be spelled Pak or Paik.

Korean export products include a large variety of manufactured consumer goods which run the whole gamut from slippers, shoes and other apparel to bicycles, from textiles to pianos, grass wallpaper, radios, sewing machines and handicrafts; also canned marine products, minerals, agricultural products and a host of others. The chief of the Asian office of America's largest chainstore came to Seoul for 10 days to investigate the market. I wish you could have heard his rhapsody of praise for Korean products.

The quality of Korean workmanship and materials is generally high and prices are extraordinarily low. One good reason for this (I guess it isn't so good) is that workers here earn from about $11 to $36 per month with the average about $21. In many industries they work 11 hours a day, from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., allowing an hour for lunch, 7 days a week, except that they get two Sundays off each month. This will help you to understand why the values are so appealing. It's no wonder, therefore, that exports have zoomed from $23 million in 1960 to $120 million last year. They will reach $170 million this year and there is no question that they will continue to rise sharply.

Twelve weeks of intensive work resulted in a 41-page report to the Korean Government on how to increase exports. Though I worked many Saturdays and Sundays, the change in my activities and surroundings made it something of a vacation. We lived in a very attractive five-room house on the USOM Post. In the evenings on the way home I was able to stop regularly at the 8th Army Officers Club for an outdoor swim, which I enjoyed while gazing up at the mountains that surrounded Seoul. It is said that you cannot stand anywhere in Korea without seeing a mountain.

A word about the personnel of USOM, which represents the AID agency operated by our State Department. These American men and women, with rare exceptions, are zealous, dedicated and able, fully on a par with those in private industry at home. They provide the technical and administrative guidance needed by Koreans in various fields, including government, agriculture, minerals, marine products, and a whole variety of consumer products. They are pursuing a unique way of life and, with an occasional break for home leave, are rotated to places like Nigeria, South Vietnam, Taiwan, and many other far-off countries. They are entitled to great admiration because they must in the nature of things make sacrifices and cast off home ties and friendships. There are compensations, of course, as they meet a great many interesting people, Korean and others. By way of example I might mention Mrs. Louise Yim, the president of Chung Ang University, formerly Minister of Commerce and Industry under the late Syngman Rhee. Mrs. Yim has been somewhat westernized so that dinner in her home was served on a table, although the food was entirely Korean. On one evening at a friend's home we had a very interesting presentation by two outstanding representatives of the U.N.'s World Health Organization, Dr. Liu Huang whose wife, Pearl, was, like him, Chinese and Dr. Harold van der Wall and his wife, Irene, both Ceylonese. On another evening we met Mr. Roy Lucas, Director of the United Nations in Korea, whose very beautiful Chinese wife is British educated. I had frequent meetings with Mr. Chul Sung Lee, Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry, a brilliant, homespun man whose mind seemed to work at an exceptionally swift pace. His charming wife and lovely daughters made good company and were rapidly assimilating some Western customs. They took a fancy to figs and some other refreshments served them which they had never eaten before. The Minister himself, Mr. Chong Hoon Park, with whom I met several times, was a highly cultured man and a man of keen perception. There were many other interesting people including members of the USOM staff.

Total United States aid to Korea since 1946 will reach more than $6 billion. I think this includes expenditures for the civil war. In 1965 grant aid has been reduced to $72 million plus about the same amount in U.S. surplus foods and loans, and it is expected that the grant aid will be reduced further next year. I know all the harsh things that have been said about our foreign aid. It is time we were reminded that such aid restored many countries in the Far East and elsewhere nearer to self-sufficiency. Too often we talk about the faults of our efforts and forget the signal successes. People often wonder whether this aid reaches the right people or finds its way only into the hands of the upper crust. One of the major purposes of foreign aid is to help people help themselves and I firmly believe that this has been accomplished even though there have been abuses. Aid funds cannot simply be handed out to the needy. They have been used in Korea and elsewhere under USOM guidance for building such things as irrigation pipes, powerplants, and factories. In the area of agricultural research, USOM assistance is directed toward improving the rice crop and the quality of silk yarn, as well as to diversify the types of crops grown. Large holdings of absentee landlords have been broken into small farms for the benefit of the rural population. They are regrettably too small to permit the use of the most modern agricultural machinery; however it has just been reported that despite a record drought, ended by record floods this past summer, South Korean farmers achieved a bumper harvest. Greater know-how, improved fertilizer, and better tools can be credited with this result. It is confidently expected that Korea, hitherto troubled by a food deficit, will in the near future be self-sufficient in food.

The Koreans are a highly cultured people. Some 50 years before Gutenberg, a Korean invented movable type. Literacy is exceptionally high. This culture is expressed today by an abiding desire on the part of parents to have at least one member of the family get the benefits of higher education. This is not easy because practically all of the universities are privately owned and operated for profit. While the tuition fee is nominal, according to our standards—it could be $75 a year—it represents a great sacrifice to the Koreans. In the city of Seoul alone there are 16 universities and they can't begin to accommodate all the students who would like to attend. Middle and high schools also charge tuition fees. Unfortunately, once graduated, the Korean has trouble finding a job that is culturally suitable and that pays adequately. One GI told me that in his compound a group of his fellow soldiers employed 14 houseboys to whom they paid $18 a month each. Some of these houseboys have baccalaureate degrees.

In a lighter vein, we laughed many times about the universal practice of Koreans to say yes where we would say no. A conversation might run something like this: "Have you any bananas today?" "No." "Oh—you have no bananas?" "Yes." We came to the conclusion that whoever wrote "Yes, We Have No Bananas" got his inspiration in Korea.

The average per capita annual income is now $95; wages run as low as 500 won or $1.70 a week. Good pay for executives in manufacturing or administration posts averages about 240,000 won a year, or $900. Despite the low-income rate, there is no sign of the acute hunger that comes with dire poverty. True there are many children begging in the streets of Seoul, at the instigation of their mothers, but they don't have the kind of swollen bellies we have seen in other countries where starvation was the order of the day. Even the poorest seemed to dress neatly. Both men and women were wearing clean, starched clothing and they were good to look at. One doesn't know whether the same impression would be created during the colder months. On many an occasion I have had a summer opinion of a city changed on a winter visit. Seoul has its share of deplorable slum areas and unfortunately the government is not in a position to do much in the way of welfare aid.

Private lenders charge whatever the traffic will bear and this could run anywhere from 60 to 100 percent per annum. In order to make loans more readily available at the banks, the National Assembly in August raised the legal maximum that the banks may charge from 20 to 36 per annum. This doesn't mean that everybody pays 36 percent to the banks. The prime rate is much lower for top credit risks and only 6½ percent for loans against foreign letters of credit received to cover export orders. The sharp increase in the bank rate has, at this writing, already begun to accomplish its purpose. It has attracted to the banks a huge increase in short- and long-term savings accounts—which earn interest up to about 30 percent a year—and has thus produced important new sources of capital for economic expansion. The higher interest rate on deposits has also, of course, attracted funds from usurious lenders. Since the beginning of 1964 the exchange rate has been quite well stabilized. In the past 6 months it has not varied more than a few won up or down, 270 to the dollar.

We happened to know a young American foreign exchange student who was living in a Korean home. He came to dinner one evening and, at our invitation, brought with him the 19-year-old son and 17-year-old daughter of his Korean hosts. This was their first experience in a Western-type home; they were very shy and ill at ease, sitting on the edge of their chairs. We were told that they don't address their father directly at any time. If there is a question to be asked, they transmit it through the mother who gives them the answer. Marriages are arranged by the parents and this seems to be accepted by the children. At least that's what we were advised. However, we had a very attractive Korean maid by the name of Kyungsan. She returned one Sunday evening from a visit to her home and we found her in tears. Her father had informed her that she was to be married in the next couple of months. She knew the young man slightly. He lived in Pusan, way off on the southeast coast of Korea.

In Seoul, as well as in the other places we visited through the country, we saw surprisingly few older people, and most of these were at work in the rice paddies. At a concert given by Arthur Fiedler in Seoul, the audience was probably 98 percent young people under 30. The huge theater was filled to overflowing. I was informed that 50 percent of the population is under 16 years. No doubt this is due, in part at least, to the decimation of the population in the recent civil war and to the high birth rate that followed.

Those Koreans, to whom we spoke, seem to feel that the United States is doing a good job in protecting them from the incursion of communism, and they like this. Just the same, they point out that the United States of America is not altruistic, but is in Korea for its own specific purpose of preventing the spread of communism. What some resent is the fact that we are encouraging ties with Japan for whom the average Korean has an intense dislike and fear. The normalization pact with Japan was passed by the National Assembly and will, when ratified by Japan, restore trade and other relations between the two countries for the first time in 55 years. While we read reports of some 10,000 students demonstrating on university grounds and in front of the National Assembly on August 25, we didn't see any of this. We were asked by USOM to avoid these areas and were requested not to attend any National Assembly sessions at any time for fear there might be an incident. The ROK troops and the police have been trained to break up these demonstrations. Tear gas and clubs are rarely used. The technique is to isolate a segment of the mob at a time and haul them away. On August 25, 715 students were arrested and hundreds were injured, including demonstrators, police, and soldiers, but the injuries were minor. Those arrested are almost all immediately released.

The United States has approximately 55,000 troops in South Korea. Most of them are, understandably, lonesome, particularly those who are stationed in small towns where entertainment and diversion are limited mostly to what the Armed Forces can provide—and they make a magnificent effort to satisfy such needs. Even in Seoul communication is hampered by language and this frustrates the GI's. The result is that they are not very laudatory in talking about Korea except for those who have been there long enough to change their attitude.

There has been an appreciable amount of intermarriage between American troops and Korean girls who, with their slender builds, gleaming white teeth and fine features, are, for the most part, quite attractive. Unfortunately, there have been some cases of abandonment of wives and children when the soldiers return home. Personally I don't think these cases are as widespread as some people do. There is a feeling of antagonism toward children of mixed blood. Several organizations have done an excellent job in trying to keep families together. One in particular is called the foster parents' plan. This organization selects a needy child whose mother, a widow, has several other children to support. These are widows who don't want to see their families broken up and who go to work to preserve their homes. The foster parents' plan obtains for each such child a private contribution of $15 a month which, together with the widow's earnings, is enough to support the entire family. These families are visited by case workers regularly. The donor pays each month so that if a family is dropped for some reason, the contribution ceases and it can be used for another family if the donor wishes.

Korea has its version of Geisha girls, called Kisaeng girls. I was invited to quite a few of the Kisaeng parties but attended only twice—largely because of the language problem, partly because of the Korean food, which I didn't like, and perhaps because I am a year or two too old for the Kisaeng girls. Actually I didn't find them as attractive as many other girls I saw. The Kisaeng girls sang and played a special kind of musical instrument, but I will take Mary Martin or Carol Channing instead.

We had the opportunity to make many excursions outside of Seoul, sometimes in connection with my work and other times on weekend holiday trips. There are palaces and temples to be seen almost everywhere but what I found most interesting was the opportunity to meet with the people, talk with them—mostly through interpreters—and observe them. Wherever we went we found beauty in the mountain scenery, the landscape and the traditional Korean clothes.

In Taegu we were taken on a tour of one of the most modern worsted textile mills I have ever seen. It is a huge plant with over a dozen buildings arranged so as to provide a perfect assembly line flow for the various processes. The equipment is the finest and in large part the most modern. The cleanliness of the buildings struck me wherever we went. You could virtually eat from the floor. In this particular plant there are 2,000 girls and some 600 men who live in dormitories provided for them, as well as residences for a few hundred married men and their families. Married women are not permitted to continue to work in the factory. Employees are provided with lunch rooms, beauty parlors, sewing rooms, television rooms and a great many other conveniences.

As you may recall, there is a demilitarized zone called the DMZ at the 38th parallel. It crosses Korea for a distance of 151 miles. It dwarfs the Berlin wall. Parties to the truce meet here at the call of one side or the other. The participants in the Armistice Commission are representatives of the United Nations on the one side, and the North Koreans and the Red Chinese on the other. We made it a point to visit on one of the days when a meeting of the Armistice Commission was called by General Yarborough who heads the U.N. component of the Commission. We were told that his predecessors had allowed the Communists to make vicious and mendacious accusations and had replied with only polite denials. The Communist charges of truce violations, over the 12 years, have exceeded 3,000. Of these the U.N. component Commission has acknowledged some nominal number—perhaps 50 over the period. Accusations from our side have been limited. The Communists have admitted two violations in all.

General Yarborough has changed tactics to the extent that he doesn't hesitate to denounce the Red charges as lies and he seizes every opportunity to mock them and their charges. One of his techniques is to speak facetiously of our side as "imperialist warmongers" thus attempting to deprive them of their favorite name-calling practice. I think he could find a more delicate way of calling them liars. It was my feeling that he was, at least in part, descending to their level and could have been equally effective without any loss of dignity or forcefulness.

When we arrived near the DMZ there was an air of tension. The roads were lined with barbed wire and there were warning signs on the side of the road that the area had been mined. We were cautioned not to talk to the North Korean guards, who appeared to me to be a sullen and unhappy group.

These meetings have been going on for 12 years, the longest cease-fire in recorded history, and no end is in sight. Nor will there be any end until the United Nations and Peiping get together on a solution. The principals meeting at the DMZ have no authority, and what they say to each other seems aimed at propaganda purposes. It is a travesty on human intelligence that this sort of thing can continue for such a long period, and it has degenerated more or less into a name-calling game. The only happy note about it is that both sides keep talking rather than shooting. There is absolutely no contact between North and South Korea, either by land or sea; no travel, no communication, no reuniting of families—just a blank wall. The East and West Germans at least have an opportunity to communicate and visit, and the East Germans even have an occasional chance to escape. Compared to this the DMZ is a water, air, and land proof closure.

Our experience in Korea will linger long in our minds as a very rewarding one. It is a country that is growing and taking its place in the world. The Koreans are genuinely appreciative of the help they are getting, and this is at least one instance where there is a minimum of traditional resentment against the benefactor for helping. Rather there is much gratitude.

We were tremendously impressed with the spirit of sacrifice and hard work that is evident among Koreans at every level and on all sides. Making due allowances for AID help, the job that is being done should be called Operation Bootstrap. Korea can properly be compared to a chrysalis that has broken out of its cocoon and is flying higher and higher with ever-increasing strength. Foreign investors are finding appealing opportunities in Korea, and, as results become known, the number of these investors ought to grow continually.

If I should be asked again next year to fill a temporary duty assignment in Korea or elsewhere, the chances are that I would gladly accept, putting it somewhat as Eisenhower did—if selected, "I will go to Korea."

And now I'm back in the thick of corporate acquisitions and finding it fascinating.

JEROME I. UDELL.

Macon Pays Last Tribute to Athlete

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY A. TAYLOR
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the attention of my colleagues an article entitled "Macon Pays Last Tribute to Athlete," appearing in the Asheville Citizen, Asheville, N.C., and written by John Parris. This article shows a deep respect and affection between the races in western North Carolina which much of the Nation does not understand.

The article follows:

MACON PAYS LAST TRIBUTE TO ATHLETE

(By John Parris)

FRANKLIN.—The people of this mountain town turned out by the hundreds Monday to pay their last respects to a young Negro athlete credited with doing more for race relations here than anybody else in the county.

They filled the auditorium of the First Baptist Church, the town's largest, where two white ministers conducted funeral services for 18-year-old Thomas Walter Scruggs, killed Christmas Eve when his car and another driven by his brother collided head-on.

They came from all walks of life and from both races. They included judges and lawyers, doctors and educators, businessmen and farmers, rich and poor, young and old.

Dr. Rufus Morgan, the famed mountain Episcopalian minister, spoke for the whole community when he said:

"We thank God for the spirit that has dominated this boy and for the way he stood out before us, an example of what all of us should be, one to another.

"In this tragedy there is a challenge to each of us. It is an example here of the power of the spirit of man to overcome the obstacles of life."

And Dr. W. Thomas Lane, pastor of the First Baptist Church, quoted from the Scriptures the words of Ephesians:

"But now in Jesus Christ, you who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ * * * and now therefore you are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God."

The services were simple and brief, but there were few dry eyes in all the crowd of more than 1,000 persons.

The body of young Scruggs, one of the first of his race to integrate at Franklin High School, lay in a gray metal casket covered with a blanket of red carnations and white mums at the front of the church.

His former high school coach, and members of the 1964–65 Franklin High championship basketball team on which he starred, were among the pallbearers.

And back of them sat the 1965–66 team from Piedmont College at Demorest, Ga., where Scruggs had become the first Negro to attend that institution and where, since October, he had become a star player.

Among the mourners was the president of Piedmont, Dr. James E. Walter, and head basketball Coach O'Neal Cave, and some 30 members of the student body.

Dr. Walter, who came here as soon as he heard of the accident, said earlier that Scruggs had become one of the most popular boys on campus.

"He was a good boy," Walter said. "He was very well liked, and I think all of us were terribly fond of him. He was well-accepted by both the faculty and the students."

The Franklin freshman, 1 of 10 children, was a starting forward on the college basketball team.

But it was in his hometown here that he was really loved and where he made an impression that will not be soon forgotten.

All day Christmas and then Sunday, a steady stream of folks came to the funeral home here, where the body lay.

All remembered him and had something to say of his good work.

"He did more for race relations here than anybody," was a comment that could be heard over and over. "He made integration work at Franklin High."

Bob Sloan, editor of the Franklin Press, said, "This is a boy we must never forget."

And the city policeman said, "He was really a fine boy."

H. Bueck, superintendent of Macon County schools, said that "young Scruggs has left us something to live up to."

And J. P. Brady, a newspaperman and civic leader, said: "Nothing has ever shook up the community like his death. The people loved him and respected him. You can see by how they turned out for his funeral. There's never been as big a funeral here before."

When the funeral was over, his former teammates and classmates wheeled the casket from the church to a waiting hearse.

And then, some 30 minutes later, Thomas Walter Scruggs was laid to rest in the cemetery of St. Ciprian's Episcopal Church.

"They have buried him," said a leading citizen, "but his spirit will go marching on. Of that, you can be sure."

Work Experience of War Veterans in 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have received from the Veterans' Administration the latest information available in that agency on work experience of war veterans in 1964. I believe it will be of interest to all Members, and, therefore, I extend my remarks and include therein this text which I have received from the Veterans' Administration:

WORK EXPERIENCE OF WAR VETERANS IN 1964

During 1964, 92 percent of the male noninstitutional war veterans in the United States were gainfully employed. About 8 percent or 1 in 12 did not work during the year, having been retired, sick or disabled, or unable to find a job. Of the 20.9 million veterans surveyed in March 1965, 75 percent (15.7 million) worked year round (50–52 weeks) the previous year, and 17 percent (3.4 million) worked only part of the year (less than 50 weeks).

Nearly all of the 15.7 million year-round workers worked full time (99 percent or 15.5 million); only 0.2 million (1 percent) worked part time. Likewise, 85 percent of the 3.4 million part-year workers, when they were employed, had full-time jobs (2.9 million), and only 15 percent (0.5 million) had part-time work. In summary, 96 percent (18.4 million) of the employed veterans were full-time employees in 1964 either at year-round or part-year jobs, and only 4 percent (0.7 million) were part-time employees, working mostly at jobs lasting only part of the year.

Looking specifically at the 1.1 million veterans 65–69 years old, the age when many persons have already retired, about half (51 percent) were still working. Of those who were employed, 6 out of 10 worked year round, and most of these held full-time jobs; about 4 out of 10 were employed only part of the year, and about half of these worked full time and the other half, part time.

Moving to the 1.1 million veterans 70 years and older, the age when most persons have retired, 29 percent still worked during 1964. Of those who worked, about half worked year round—7 out of 10 full time and 3 out of 10 part time; the other half worked part year—1 out of 4 full time and the other 3 part time.

The attached tables present additional detailed data. Special tabulations of the Census Bureau's current population survey, made under contract for the Veterans' Administration, provided this information.

TABLE 1.—*Work experience in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States, by age*

1964 work experience	Total	Age in March 1965									
		Under 30 years	30 to 34 years	35 to 39 years	40 to 44 years	45 to 49 years	50 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years	65 to 69 years	70 years and over
TOTAL WAR VETERANS											
Number (in thousands)	20,868	463	2,700	4,000	4,922	3,541	1,784	968	352	1,063	1,075
Worked in 1964	19,084	458	2,648	3,956	4,848	3,442	1,712	877	286	544	313
Year-round workers	15,671	363	2,215	3,371	3,971	2,933	1,440	693	212	324	149
Part-year workers	3,413	95	433	585	877	509	272	184	74	220	164
Did not work in 1964	1,784	5	52	44	74	99	72	91	66	519	762
PERCENT BY AGE											
Worked in 1964	100	2	14	21	25	18	9	5	1	3	2
Year-round workers	100	2	14	22	25	19	9	5	1	2	1
Part-year workers	100	3	13	17	26	15	8	5	2	6	5
Did not work in 1964	100	(1)	3	2	4	6	4	5	4	29	43
PERCENT BY WORK EXPERIENCE											
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Worked in 1964	92	99	98	99	98	97	96	91	81	51	29
Year-round	75	78	82	84	80	83	81	72	60	30	14
Full time	74	77	82	84	80	82	80	70	57	25	10
Part time	1	1	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	1	2	3	5	4
Part year	17	21	16	15	18	14	15	19	21	21	15
Full time	14	18	15	14	16	13	13	17	14	11	4
Part time	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	2	7	10	11
Did not work in 1964	8	1	2	1	2	3	4	9	19	49	71

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

TABLE 2.—*Work experience and weeks worked by full-time workers in 1964, for noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States, by age*

1964 work experience	Total	Age in March 1965									
		Under 30 years	30 to 34 years	35 to 39 years	40 to 44 years	45 to 49 years	50 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years	65 to 69 years	70 years and over
TOTAL WAR VETERANS											
Number (in thousands)	20,868	463	2,700	4,000	4,922	3,541	1,784	968	352	1,063	1,075
Worked in 1964	19,084	458	2,648	3,956	4,848	3,442	1,712	877	286	544	313
Full time	18,345	442	2,607	3,896	4,759	3,364	1,653	844	249	380	151
Part time	739	16	41	60	89	78	59	33	37	164	162
Did not work in 1964	1,784	5	52	44	74	99	72	91	66	519	762
PERCENT BY AGE											
Full time	100	3	14	21	26	18	9	5	1	2	1
Part time	100	2	6	8	12	11	8	4	5	22	22
PERCENT BY WORK EXPERIENCE											
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Worked in 1964	92	99	98	99	98	97	96	91	81	51	29
Full time	88	96	97	97	96	95	93	87	71	36	14
50 to 52 weeks	74	77	82	84	80	82	80	70	57	25	10
48 to 49 weeks	2	3	4	3	3	2	3	3	1	1	(1)
40 to 47 weeks	5	4	5	4	6	5	5	5	3	2	1
27 to 39 weeks	4	6	4	4	4	4	3	5	2	2	1
14 to 26 weeks	2	5	1	1	2	1	1	2	6	4	1
1 to 13 weeks	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1
Part time	4	3	1	2	2	2	3	4	10	15	15
Did not work in 1964	8	1	2	1	2	3	4	9	19	49	71

---

[1] Less than 0.5 percent.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data

Information about the 1964 work experience of male civilian noninstitutional war veterans in the United States (obtained in February 1965) was derived from the Bureau of the Census' matched February–March current population survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The work experience distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional war veteran population in the United States to develop the work experience data presented in this report. Although work experience data are for the year 1964, the age refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see Consumer Income, Current Population Reports, series P–60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

War veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces during a war period (Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Korean conflict) and are now in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States. The civilian noninstitutional population excludes all members of the Armed Forces and inmates of penal institutions, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and the like.

Reliability of the estimates

Since the estimates are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and intreviewers. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and reporting, and to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability; that is, of the variations that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. As calculated for this report, the standard error also partially measures the effects of response and enumeration errors but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample will differ from a complete census figure by less than one standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error. The following table shows the approximate standard error of an estimated percentage computed by using sample data for both the numerator and denominator of the percentage. The size of the standard error depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the class upon which the percentage is based.

Standard errors of estimated percentages (68 changes out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)						
	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000
2 or 98	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
5 or 95	2.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.6	.4	.3
10 or 90	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.2	.8	.6	.4
15 or 85	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.4	1.0	.7	.4
20 or 80	5.1	3.6	2.5	1.6	1.1	.8	.5
25 or 75	5.5	3.9	2.8	1.8	1.3	.8	.6
35 or 65	6.1	4.3	3.1	2.0	1.4	.9	.6
50	6.4	4.5	3.2	2.0	1.4	1.0	.7

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress begins, people throughout the world are deeply concerned about the war in Vietnam and the course which will be taken in the year ahead. The Members of this distinguished Chamber have a responsibility to express themselves to their constituents, to the Nation, and to the world on this, the most vital issue of the day.

During the period of adjournment, I had the opportunity to address thousands of my constituents in 43 speaking engagements and appearances, during which I discussed a variety of subjects. Invariably the first question raised was on the subject of U.S. policy in southeast Asia and our commitment in South Vietnam. While the greatest number appeared to support the administration policy, they seemed unanimous in urging that we find an avenue to peace.

I also visited Thailand where I discussed the situation in South Vietnam with servicemen, some of whom reside in Fifth Congressional District of New York. They all seemed to under stand the reasons for our commitment in southeast Asia and they questioned why some at home failed to understand as well. They also shared the desire for peace and urged that every diplomatic channel bekept open to encourage initiation of negotiations for peace.

Our Nation is the strongest and greatest power in the world today—but with that power goes responsibility. No nation can have great power and a quiet conscience. Its leaders and its people must sometimes suffer either the reproaches of having used force or the reproaches of having failed to use it.

I am distressed by the increasing U.S. losses and the increased role of our troops in combat zones. I abhor war and the misery caused by human conflict. Our President had made it clear that our bipartisan foreign policy is to defend South Vietnam so long as aggression from the north continues. Our Nation wants peace and President Johnson has made it clear that we stand ready to engage in unconditional discussions to consider any solution which will bring peace to this troubled area of the world.

On December 18, 1965, in response to the voices of my constituents, I sent the following telegram to the President:

> Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
> *President of the United States,*
> *White House, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> In light of the offer for a 12-hour truce to permit American boys to celebrate Christmas, I respectfully suggest that you announce the acceptance of the offer and implement immediately negotiations to extend the truce. I further respectfully recommend that as evidence our announced intentions to negotiate and to demonstrate American compassion, you direct cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam pending the negotiations now under condideration. The month of December should not be the only period to practice peace on earth and good will toward men. We must work at it 365 days a year.
>
> HERBERT TENZER,
> *Member of Congress.*

I was as pleased as you were to listen to the voices which followed and to see how the administration responded to the voice of the people. Diplomatic channels were opened with dynamic and energetic force. Every effort was made to convince the nations of the world that the United States truly wanted peace in southeast Asia.

While we continue to meet our commitment in South Vietnam we must always bear in mind that to negotiate is not to capitulate. In the nuclear age when man is capable of self-destruction there is even greater reason to strive for peace, however, in so doing we cannot turn our back on tyranny and injustice anywhere in the world.

In one of our southern cities, the home of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, which has the greatest number of families with men in Vietnam per capita of any city in the United States, there was a demonstration of women and children asking that we "support their daddies in South Vietnam." Not one sign read "Send my daddy home."

Let those who demonstrated and participated in paying for full page ads, urging a cessation of bombings in North Vietnam, now take ads urging Hanoi to understand that our Government is serious in its efforts to transfer the war from the battlefield to the conference table.

There were less ships of our allies reaching the port of Haiphong with supplies during 1965 than there were in 1964. The progress in this area, while significant, is not yet enough. We should consider seriously the termination of any and all aid to nations carrying supplies to our enemies.

We should also give consideration to the blockade of the port of Haiphong thereby cutting off the supplies which our enemy uses to support their aggression.

I favor a continuing dialog—both public and in the Congress—on this most vital issue of the day. The voices of our Representatives should echo through this Chamber during the session which started today so that people in the United States and throughout the world may look to the strongest democracy in the world for guidance and strength in the trying hours and days which lie ahead. This Chamber of freemen must not shrink from its responsibility of sounding the commitment for freedom and the search for peace in the world. It should distinguish itself by being both a forum for freedom and a forum for peace. Our President needs our support and the people deserve our continuing expression of their hopes for peace.

Wyoming: Nation's No. 1 Oil State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the men who come to Wyoming assist in its development and contribute much to the culture and personality of this great State. Such a man is Roy H. Guess, a Texas native who received his bachelor's and master's degree in geology from the University of Texas. After his graduation in 1940 he spent 4 years in the Air Force during World War II.

Two and a half years ago Mr. and Mrs. Guess and their two children transferred their base to Casper, the center of a "wildcatters paradise," where he can pursue his hobby of skiing and breathe the fresh air of Wyoming.

He has written several articles. One called "What Lures Drillers to Wyoming," appeared in the May 10, 1965, issue of Oil and Gas Journal; another "Oil Exploration in Wyoming" appeared in the South Texas Geological Society Bulletin in April 1965.

Most recently, Mr. Speaker, is "Increased Drilling Seen in 'Wildcatters Paradise' " which was published in the December issue of Independent Petroleum Monthly.

The article follows:

> The general health of the independent segment of the oil industry today reminds me of the story of two skeletons hanging in a closet. One skeleton turned to the other and said, "How in the world did we get locked in here?" The other skeleton rattled back, "I don't know, but if we had any guts we'd get out."
>
> A great deal of the highly infectious, irresistible urge to "wildcat" for the yet undiscovered wealth in giant oilfields seems to have disappeared from the ranks of the independent producer today. We study mergers, sellouts, stock swaps, diversification, etc.; but if we have to consider pulling up stakes and moving to greener pastures, the obstacles are just too great.
>
> During 1965, the Shell Oil Co. clearly demonstrated that 100 million barrel oilfields can still be found in Wyoming. Their Reno unit discovery is currently producing 2,500 barrels per day and has been confirmed by two offsets of equal caliber. A 6-mile step-out to the west appears to be most promising at the present time. The industry in Wyoming probably would have assigned odds of 50 to 1 against Shell's discovery being a commercial well in the Minnelusa (Tensleep) prior to drilling and, no doubt, the odds of finding a 100 million barrels would have been beyond estimation.
>
> Undoubtedly, 1966 will bring intensive efforts to find other large fields in the deep, virtually unexplored interior portions of half a dozen of Wyoming's basins that are ringed by shallow highly prolific oilfields. Ten seismic crews are currently working in the Powder River Basin, trying to obtain information that will help duplicate the Shell discovery.
>
> It is certainly true that most of the shallow "sheepherder's structures" have been drilled in Wyoming, but prospecting for stratigraphic traps is just in its infancy. Sophisticated stratigraphic studies are certain to play in increasingly important role in future exploration plans of both major and independent oil companies. The Sundance formation may be a real "sleeper" in several areas.
>
> Thermal recovery projects, in the shallow heavy oil and tar sand areas of Wyoming, have ben included in the 1966 plans of several companies. The next 5 years should bring rapid increases in this type of production. Due to the completion of several 1,000 barrel-per-day fractured shale wells during 1965, this type of exploration will receive a great deal of attention during the coming year. This will give subsurface information that will lead to additional discoveries in other formations.
>
> Perhaps "Wyoming, the Wildcatter's Paradise," the title of a recent address by Dr. George R. Wulf, is a slightly optimistic description, but with proration, a favorable marketing situation, an abundance of unexplored but highly prospective acreage, this area come closer to fitting this description than any other area in the United States. I believe these factors will cause a gradual increase in drilling activity in Wyoming and surrounding States by aggressive independent oil companies in 1966 and beyond.

On Throwing Tantrums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of October 27, 1965, on the present youthful demonstrations against the Vietnam war strikes a very responsive chord in the minds of those opposed to such demonstrations:

> ON THROWING TANTRUMS
>
> Even after all the discounting is duly done, the current rash of youthful demonstrations against the Vietnam war must puzzle the mind and conscience of thoughtful men. Is it a case of young people failing society or the other way around? Or some of both?
>
> Granted, the eruptions do not represent majority American opinion, including that of college students themselves, however disturbing may be the plain thread of extreme leftist instigation or encouragement. It is perhaps indicative of the general mood of the country that the purported pacifists are evoking counter-demonstrations in support of the administration's Vietnam policy. In any event, taking to the streets with a grievance is nothing new. Finally, it can be con-

ceded that this is a peculiarly messy, disagreeable war, despite its broad objective of containing communism.

Still, the protesters, whether committing illegal acts like burning their draft cards or indulging in peaceful marches, are giving a certain amount of aid and comfort to the enemy. And all too evidently there behavior is part of a broader pattern of disrespect for law and order. While their conduct is not to be condoned, it is at the same time instructive to see where their elders have let them down.

For whatever reasons, this century has witnessed a decline in the disciplines of home, school, and church; indeed, in the attitudes of the courts and governmental officials. The atmosphere has been one of pervasive permissiveness, part of which is the notion that to impose standards of behavior on a child is somehow to stunt his development.

What too often turns out to be stunted, of course, is the child's sense of the importance of an orderly society. His view of his role is likely to become a self-centered arrogance to do as he pleases without regard to the consequences. Former President Eisenhower is among those who clearly understand this tendency toward erosion of "the old virtues."

Without presuming to make a precise allocation of the blame, we think it beyond question that the contemporary liberal philosophy which has dominated the intellectual fashion of a generation has made a sizable contribution. For it is preeminently a philosophy of irresponsibility; that is, the individual is not regarded as particularly accountable for his actions. If he goes wrong, or criminal, or delinquent, or otherwise antisocial, the society is presumed guilty. The curious cure recommended is for the society in the form of government to take over more and more of the responsibilities abdicated by individual, family, minister, and teacher.

Given the prevailing winds, it seems to us equally undeniable that the civil rights movement has provided fresh impetus to the fad of disrespect for law and order. While most Americans sympathize with the aims of the movement, it has nonetheless brought a sort of status to mob action. More significantly, it has enshrined the doctrine that people are morally obliged to obey only the laws they think just and to disobey the rest—taking to the streets if they want until the offending authority has buckled under.

A viewpoint more corrosive to a society conceived in the framework of both liberty and order is hard to imagine. Not surprisingly, some of the same students and leaders and professors who have been foremost in advocating disobedience of laws they don't like are also the most vociferous objectors to the Vietnam war. Any cause, so long as it is anti-law-and-order, apparently will do.

By now this variety of free speech—which is devoid of intellectual content, invites no debate, tolerates no rebuttal, trades on emotion, bases its appeal on sheer numbers of demonstrators and beckons to exploitation—has become so accepted it is employed on the slightest impulse by dissatisfied groups of every description. In our opinion, it cannot be too strongly emphasized that most of the street action is not an expression but a debasement of honest public discussion of the issues, Vietnam or anything else, and in fact of the whole constitutional concept of free assembly.

Probably in many cases the youthful pacifist will outgrow their enthusiasm for nose thumbing. For more disquieting than their antics of the moment is that we the adults have done so much to foster the childish idea that anyone can have his own way just by throwing a tantrum.

Independence of Cameroon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of January, the Federal Republic of Cameroon celebrated the 6th anniversary of her independence. Congress was not in session on this, and I am therefore, belatedly, extending warm felicitations to His Excellency Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of Cameroon; and to His Excellency, Joseph Owono, Cameroon's Ambassador to the United States.

This date marked the anniversary of the independence of a most unusual African state. This pleasant and beautiful country is Africa's only example of a federation of English-speaking and French-speaking states. The federation is almost as large as the State of Texas, and has a growing population, numbering at present in excess of 4 million.

The Cameroon was a German protectorate from 1884 to 1916 but was split following World War I into two League of Nations mandates, one British and one French. Following World War II, these areas were converted into United Nations Trust Territories. Each Cameroon attained independence in 1960 and, after plebiscites in the British Cameroons—February 1961—the present federation was created. The northern part of the British Cameroons, whose citizens rejected federation with the Cameroon Republic, became an integral part of the northern region of Nigeria in July 1961.

Agriculture is the main occupation of the vast majority of the population and agricultural produce accounts for approximately 80 percent of the country's exports. Cameroon is nearly self-sufficient in many food resources, some of which are peanuts, bananas, millet, and palm oil products. This fact alone gives it an advantage over many newly independent states.

Another bright spot in Cameroon's economic picture is the potential of its mining industry. There is a large variety of mineral deposits such as gold, diamonds, manganese, mica, lignite, bauxite, and rutile—a primary source of titanium. Thus far, however, only bauxite—aluminum ore—has been found in large quantity. Work is now well underway on the construction of a north-south railway route that will facilitate the transport of bauxite from the newly discovered Tibati deposit of East Cameroon.

Though the federation has been beset with problems arising largely from cultural differences which are a remnant of the colonial past, Government officials have been steadfast in their determination to keep these issues from fragmenting the federal structure.

I am certain that the Congress and the Nation join me in a salute to the gallant struggle for unity and progress which Cameroon is striving to achieve. On this, the sixth anniversary of the Federal Republic of the Cameroon, I offer my warmest congratulations and best wishes for the future.

State of Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD H. POFF

OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, last July at a meeting of the State Bar of Texas in Fort Worth, the then president of the American Bar Association, Lewis F. Powell, Jr., Esq., made an address which was most topical and timely and one which I think should be made available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to a nationwide audience.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks, I quote herewith the entire text of Mr. Powell's speech entitled "State of Law and Order."

STATE OF LAW AND ORDER

In traveling about the country, talking with lawyers and judges, I find a deepening concern over the deteriorating state of law and order in our country.

You are, of course, familiar with the nationwide crime problem. President Johnson has aptly said: "Crime is a malignant enemy in America's midst."

The President did not exaggerate. Major crime is increasing annually, five times faster than population growth. More than 2½ million serious crimes were committed in 1964.

J. Edgar Hoover, saying that many urban areas are jungles of terror, has warned citizens to stay off the streets and out of the parks at night.

Mr. Justice Clark, in a splendid address to the Chattanooga bar, recently summarized the situation:

"One of the sordid tragedies in America today is the malignant growth of disrespect for law and order. The evidence is all too clear. It can be found in incidents of outright mob violence. It can be found in the unprovoked attacks upon police officers who are carrying out their official duties, as well as the incredibly callous attitude of citizens who have refused to aid, in any manner, helpless victims of street crimes. Indeed, marauding gangs, purse snatchers, robbers, and rapists have turned our public sidewalks and streets into places of fear for the law-abiding citizen * * *. There has been an alarming increase of serious crime in every community across the Nation."

While there is debate as to the causes of crime—and these are complex and deep rooted—there is wide agreement that it is a first duty of government, at all levels, to protect citizens in their persons and property from criminal molestation.

Government is now moving on a broad front. President Johnson has voiced his concern, and the Department of Justice has taken a number of constructive steps.

The ABA also has a major criminal justice project, in which several distinguished Texas lawyers and judges are participating.

So much for a thumb-nail and oversimplified picture of the crime situation. This may indeed be our No. 1 domestic problem.

But at least the public understands this problem and its relation to law and order. Indeed, the public is now alarmed and is demanding remedial action.

Lawyers are also concerned about a different aspect of deteriorating law and order. This relates—not to crime as such—but to the growing lack of respect for law and for due process, and the unwillingness of many to resolve differences by established legal means.

There are many contemporary symptoms of this. Yet the public is largely unaware of the scope and implications of this trend.

In a brief talk, I can only mention certain attitudes which are of special concern to lawyers.

These are not usually held by persons with any conscious intent to be lawless. Indeed, the attitudes are often expounded by persons of good will and fine intentions—including those who advocate them in the name of justice and morality.

But whatever may be the motives, certain widely held attitudes today reflect a failure to comprehend the significance of due process and the importance of lawful means.

One of these attitudes, which contributes to the lack of respect for law, is the growing belief that laws and court orders are to be obeyed, constitutional safeguards honored, and the rights of others respected only so long as they do not interfere with the attainment of goals believed to be just.

It was seriously argued in many areas of the South, following *Brown* v. *Board of Education*,[1] that massive disobedience of court orders and decisions was a proper form of protest. Indeed, there were some who sincerely espoused the right of each State to interpose its own will against Federal laws and decisions.

Today, there are others—with quite opposite goals—who insist with equal fervor that civil disobedience of laws deemed to be unjust is a legitimate means of asserting desired rights.

Ghandi's heroic struggle for India's independence is the precedent often cited for the doctrine of civil disobedience. Yet this technique was used in India, not as a means of enforcing recognized legal or constitutional rights, but to attain national independence. There were no courts and no democratically established political institutions in which the issue of independence could be contested. Indeed with lawful remedies unavailable, Ghandi's alternatives were civil disobedience or bloodshed. There is no parallel situation in America where wrongs may be redressed in the courts and through established political institutions.

This is not, contrary to popular misconception, a question of civil rights. I am concerned only with the principles involved. The issue is the fundamental one of law and order and due process. Mr. Justice Black has spoken eloquently on this subject:

"The streets are not now and never have been the proper place to administer justice. Use of the streets for such purpose has always proved disastrous to individual liberty in the long run, whatever fleeting benefits may have appeared to have been achieved. And minority groups * * * are the ones who always have suffered and always will suffer most when street multitudes are allowed to substitute their pressures for the less glamorous but more dependable and temperate process of the law. Experience demonstrates that it is not a far step from what seems the earnest, honest, patriotic, kind-spirited multitude of today, to the fanatical, threatening, lawless mob of tomorrow. And the crowds that press in the streets for noble goals today can be supplanted tomorrow by street mobs pressuring the courts for precisely opposite ends.

"Those who encourage minority groups to believe that the U.S. Constitution and Federal laws give them a right to patrol and picket the streets whenever they choose in order to advance what they think to be a just and noble end, do no service to those minority groups, their cause or their country."[2]

In our complex society power is diffused among many groups and seldom remains static. Public opinion is capable of abrupt swings. Individuals and particular groups can accordingly never be certain that they will always be strong enough to force others to respect their rights. They can be assured that they will remain free to speak their views and be protected in their persons and property only so long as laws are observed and due process followed.

Disrespect for law and an impatience with orderly processes have begun to appear on college campuses. With student riots making headlines around the world, it is to their credit that American students generally have behaved so maturely. But the major campus eruption at the University of California last winter was ominous. Reasonable discussion of alleged grievances was abandoned in favor of massive sit-ins and mob action.[3] Even certain elements of the faculty condoned rather than condemned this resort to physical coercion.

The brand of civil disobedience which virtually paralyzed the University of California has been exported to some other campuses. Leaders of the Berkeley revolt are moving out as missionaries, urging student discord and uprisings elsewhere.

The new "cause" is opposition to America's foreign policy—especially in Vietnam. This is a popular cause for various reasons, and perhaps it is natural that it should have appeal to the youth.

There are, indeed, sound reasons for the widest debate of the dangerous situation in southeast Asia—both on and off the college campus. And there have been constructive and responsible discussions in so-called teach-ins and seminars by students and faculties at many universities. This type of discourse is to be commended.

But the frenetic attack sometimes made on the administration's policy in Vietnam illustrates the thin line that may exist between legitimate protest and irresponsible conduct.

For example, a small student group at Columbia recently forced the university to cancel the annual award ceremony for the Naval Reserve Training Unit. The familiar tactics of civil disobedience were employed. This was not legitimate protest. It was coercion.

James Reston, noted columnist of the New York Times, has referred to the mood on some campuses as one of "violence" with sit-ins and inflammatory demonstrations taking the place of reasoned discussion. Mr. Reston pointed out that some of the student and teacher demonstrations have been "backed by (anti-American) propaganda of the most vicious nature."

It is happily true that only a small minority of American students have shown this reckless disregard for orderly processes and the rights of others. In deploring this conduct we must of course keep it in perspective But history has demonstrated the disruptivee power for evil of small lawless groups, especially where their movements are infiltrated by trained subversives or determined extremists.[4]

Traditionally our universities have been the citadels of free inquiry, devoted to the proposition that rational discussion was the surest way to truth. Those who now recklessly break this tradition of respect and tolerance for the differing views of others by resorting to coercion, whether violent or nonviolent, menace the spirit of responsible inquiry so essential to an institution of learning. They also contribute to the growing disrespect for orderly processes—whether they be prescribed by law of the land or as duly adopted rules of a great university.

The frightening aspect of the civil disobedience concept—in all of its various manifestations—is that it tends to escalate. It spreads geographically. The worthiness of causes becomes increasingly marginal—and sometimes are patently indefensible. Also, it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain the distinction between genuine peaceful protest and legitimate demonstrations, on the one hand, and disorderly conduct and mob violence on the other.

However successful the tactics of civil disobedience may be in the sort run, and whatever the justification, they are self-defeating and imperil individual freedom in the long run. An ordered society cannot exist if every man may determine which laws he will obey, and if techniques of coercion supplant due process. Many centuries of human misery show that once a society departs from the rule of law, only the strongest remain free. In the end, tyranny is the inevitable result of this form of anarchy.

And here, as a lawyer, may I emphasize that the right of dissent is surely a vital part of our American heritage. So also are the rights to assemble, to petition and to test the validity of challenged laws or regulations. But our Constitution and tradition contemplate the orderly assertion of these rights. There is no place in our system for either the lawless instrument of the mob or the hooded vigilante who rides in the night.

We have preserved individual freedom under the Anglo-American system of law for perhaps the longest sustained period in human history. We have done so by accepting the rule of law and by adherence to lawful means. The fundamental difference between a totalitarian society, and one in which the individual is afforded freedom of conscience and protected from arbitrary force, is that in the latter "means" are of the essence. Under our system, the "end," however worthy, should never justify resort to unlawful means.

Justice Douglas has put it quite simply: "We reject the philosophy that the end justifies the means. The vitality of human rights means respect for procedure as well as respect for substantive rights. A court cannot render dispassionate justice in the presence of a howling mob. History shows that man's struggle to be free is in large degree the struggle to be free of oppressive procedure."[5]

---

[1] 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[2] Dissenting opinion *Cox* v. *Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 559, 575, at 583–584 (1965).

[3] Prof. Lipset and Seabury were quoted in Look as commenting perceptively on this situation as follows: "The startling incomprehension or indifference shown by some of the best students in the country to the values of due process * * * challenges the very foundation of our democratic order * * *. A whole generation may learn that ends justify any means." Look magazine, Feb. 23, 1965. For interesting comments on the Berkeley riots, see the statement of Dr. Max Rafferty, California State superintendent of public instruction, reported in U.S. News & World Report, May 17, 1965, pp. 70–72.

[4] J. Edgar Hoover and others have noted the danger of Communist infiltration. Mr. Hoover, testifying before a congressional committee stated: "Communist Party leaders (expect) to exploit similar student demonstrations for their own benefit in the future." New York Times, May 18, 1965.

[5] Douglas, address before Judicial Conference of the Americas, San Juan, P.R., May 26, 1965.

We will continue to preserve individual freedom and protect human rights only so long as we adhere to this fundamental principle. The courts and legislative halls, rather than the streets, must be the places where differences are reconciled and individual rights are ultimately protected and secured.[6]

There are certainly no easy solutions to these trends and attitudes which so deeply concern lawyers. And yet I think most of us would agree upon the essentials: America needs a genuine revival of respect for law and orderly processes, a reawakening of individual responsibility, a new impatience with those who violate and circumvent laws, and a determined insistence that laws be enforced, courts respected, and due process followed.

At the same time, we must ever strive to eliminate injustice and discrimination; we must minimize the social and economic conditions which breed crime and unrest; and, perhaps most important of all, we must assure adequate and equal educational opportunities.

But underlying and sustaining all else—indeed, the indispensable cornerstone of our liberties and our opportunities—is the rule of law.

The average citizen, as well as lawyers and judges, must understand the enduring values of lawful means, and be as willing to rebuke a departure from such means as we all are to condemn crime.

Our freedoms can only survive in an ordered society, where there is genuine respect in action as well as words, for law and orderly processes.

The bringing about of this understanding must ever be a first duty of the organized bar and each individual lawyer.

---

[6] "The final answer will not be found in armed confrontation but in the process of law. We have acted to bring this conflict from the streets to the courtroom." President Johnson at his Mar. 13, 1965, news conference as reported in the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1965, p. 62.

Worldwide Population Explosion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, although the press has done an excellent job of telling us what we will be doing in the session which opens today, I have yet to see included in the subjects for action the establishment of a policy to deal with the worldwide population explosion. The press has forecast that the Congress will deal with the symptoms of this explosion, that we will attempt to prescribe painkillers to make them hurt a little less. But the press has not forecast that we will discuss the fundamentals of the problem and take action which seems appropriate.

Let us be blunt, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of important issues which will be acted upon by this 2d session of the 89th Congress. But no issue is more important and no set of problems are more pressing than the world population explosion. I would submit that if this Congress will accept its clear responsibility to establish policies to deal with the population explosion, it will be remembered far more for this reason than for any other.

We can take constructive action in this field. We can support the efforts already initiated by President Johnson. We can encourage their expansion. And we can pass legislation establishing our belief that family planning information, services, and supplies should be made available to all who request them. We should also make it clear that such information, services, and supplies should be a part of our AID programs, upon request of the foreign governments involved.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should make it clear that we see no possibility whatsoever of providing enough surplus food from our own lands to prevent mass starvation in countries whose populations will at least double in the next 25 years if family planning programs are not undertaken on a broad scale. We would delude both oursleves and countries abroad if we claimed otherwise.

It is my greatest hope that this session the Congress will address itself squarely and vigorously to the problems of family planning, birth control, and the population—both here and abroad.

We made 5 days of progress last year, but the problem grew by 365 days. We cannot afford to allow another year to slip by with no action. For the problem will soon be so great that no solution within our values will be possible.

Mail Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions in the past I have called attention to the deteriorating postal service and am inserting in today's Record another telling example of a Government plan gone awry. Mr. Steven M. Lovelady, writing in the Wall Street Journal of November 22, 1965, relates the story of snarls and long delays in rural mail service.

The Congress has a responsibility to see that these conditions are corrected promptly—and I urge the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to look into the situation and recommend whatever funds are necessary to improve the service.

Mr. Lovelady's article follows:

Mail Mess: Plan To Speed Deliveries Backfires in Many Areas

(By Steven M. Lovelady)

Rochester, Ind.—How does a piece of mail get from this sleepy county seat of 4,900 in the heart of central Indiana corn country to Mentone, a hamlet of 800 a dozen miles to the northeast?

It travels 190 miles in four different directions, none of them northeast, that's how. Mentone-bound mail goes first to Kokomo, 50 miles south. There it's sorted from the flood of mail that pours into Kokomo from 87 towns in the area. Next, it's trucked 80 miles north to South Bend, bypassing both Rochester and Mentone on the way. From South Bend, it goes 60 miles southeast to Warsaw, and, finally southwest to Mentone, where it's delivered, as much as 4 days after leaving Rochester.

Paradoxically, the long, looping path this mail takes is part of a complex Government plan aimed at speeding deliveries and boosting the efficiency of the postal system. But talks with angry Hoosiers affected—and this includes everyone from smalltown businessmen to overworked postal clerks—indicate that the new system, far from speeding deliveries, is resulting in long delays, particularly in rural areas, and is swamping some post offices with incoming mail. These men point to the decline in mail service brought about by the new system as one more example of Government planning gone awry.

The system is based on 553 sectional centers across the country. Each center sorts all mail going to and coming from smaller towns in a particular ZIP code district. The first three numbers of a ZIP code designate a sectional center. In cases where local train routes have been discontinued, the sectional centers do the sorting that was formerly done in mail cars. The sectional centers are one step in the Post Office plan to get the ZIP system in gear by January 1967.

THE ROOF FELL IN

Although the first sectional centers were set up as long ago as 1961, new ones continue to be opened. The snarls are particularly bad during the period when an area is changing over to the new system or rearranging its established sectional centers. In fact, here in Indiana, mail service under sectional centers, while far from streamlined, brought few complaints until June, when four new sectional centers were opened and four old ones abolished. Then, as one Indiana postmaster says, "The roof fell in. On paper, the new setup looks smooth as glass, but in practice it's led to logjams of mail in the sectional centers and deliveries as much as 7 days late."

This official points out that the letter from Rochester to Mentone first goes to Kokomo because Kokomo is now Rochester's sectional center. It then goes north to South Bend before being sent to Mentone because South Bend is Mentone's new sectional center—even though Mentone is just a few fields of corn up the road from Rochester.

Ideally, a letter could take that long, roundabout path overnight and still be delivered the next morning. That was the Post Office's original intent. However, what postal authorities didn't count on or prepare for was the overwhelming avalanche of mail that poured into sectional centers such as Kokomo and South Bend on initiation of the new system. The Kokomo post office, in fact, was buried under such a mountain of mail that first week in June that it gave up trying to deliver second- and third-class mail and concentrated on trying to handle the first class. "The sectional centers just don't have the men or equipment needed to move that much mail," comments another Indiana postmaster.

Perhaps hardest hit by slow mail deliveries are Indiana's 291 small local newspapers—all of the State's weeklies and those dailies with less than 10,000 circulation. Most of them are delivered by mail to subscribers, many of whom live on farms and in nearby towns.

Typical is Jack K. Overmyer, editor of this town's daily Rochester Sentinel, a thriving enterprise with a circulation of 4,239. As Mr. Overmyer sits in his office looking out on the century-old Rochester courthouse square, he tells an inquirer that "slow mail service can kill a small newspaper. When we get to subscribers 2 or 3 days late, we stand a good chance of losing those subscribers and then advertisers who aim ads at those subscribers. By taking that roundabout route, the post office winds up delivering Thursday's paper on Monday. Who wants Thursday's news on Monday? What advertiser wants his Thursday sale ads read by customers the next Monday?

After several fruitless complaints to postal authorities, Mr. Overmyer gave up. He now sends papers to Mentone subscribers by truck and pays for it from his own pocket.

Just as affected, but less vocal than the newspapermen, are businessmen in Indiana's small towns. L. J. Castaldi, vice president of the Midwest Spring Co., in Mentone, says he must "keep in constant and quick mail communication with our offices in Chicago. But an airmail, special delivery letter from Chicago to Mentone—120 miles—usually takes 2 days to get here." Mr. Castaldi says the same letter would have made the trip "in a matter of hours" before sectional centers. He estimates he has filed "100 to 150" complaints with the post office.

While permanent sectional centers are new to Indiana, and this no doubt has caused some of the trouble, checks in nine States where the system has been in operation for from 1 to nearly 2 years indicate that in most cases slow delivery and jammed post offices don't disappear with time. Pikeville, Ky., has been a sectional center for 18 months, but there was such a jam-up there in recent weeks that second- and third-class mail was stuck in the office for as much as 7 days before harried mail clerks could sort it and send it on its way.

"We're really in a mess here," says Zach C. Justice, editor of the weekly Pikeville County News. "We're barraged with more delivery complaints from rural subscribers than I've ever seen before. Besides that, every day in the mail I get anywhere from five to eight letters that don't belong to me."

Similarly, in Pueblo, Colo., which has been a sectional center for 13 months, postal clerks are still working 56-hour weeks in an attempt to move the mountain of mail which descends on their station.

And in Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., which has been part of a sectional center district for 18 months, the chamber of commerce kept tabs recently on 2,087 pieces of first-class mail sent to distant points. The chamber says 57 percent of the letters mailed to Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and Chicago took 2 days to arrive and 12 percent took 3, 4, and 5 days. Further, one letter mailed to Wisconsin Rapids from New York was 23 days in transit and another from Fort Wayne, Ind., made the trip in 17 days.

WANTED: MORE MONEY

Bombarded by complaints from these diverse geographical points, the Post Office Department in Washington is scrambling to pump extra men and equipment into the overloaded sectional centers. "But," says a spokesman, "we're operating under tight manpower and budgetary ceilings." The Department has requested a $41.5 million emergency appropriation which it expects Congress to approve once it reconvenes. Meanwhile, "We're spending the money before we've got it," a spokesman says.

This move contrasts with statements made last spring by former Postmaster General John A. Gronouski to the effect that sectional centers and ZIP coding could save the Post Office $61 to $71 million a year in labor costs and that the new system would allow the post office to eliminate 10,000 clerks from its payroll.

W. L. Pierceson, Illinois president of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, says sectional centers and ZIP coding can and will meet post office promises of speedier delivery eventually. "But they were sure wrong," he says, "when they said they could do that at lower costs and with less men at work."

To back up his view, Mr. Pierceson points to the Rock Island, Ill., secional center, which has been in operation for 2 years and which, apparently, does speed mail delivery. "Rock Island is successful," Mr. Pierceson says, "because when it became a sectional center personnel from nearby post offices—Davenport, Iowa, and Moline, Ill.—were transferred to Rock Island to handle the load."

The feeling among some postmasters is that with a new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. O'Brien, the Department might be less committed to meeting Mr. Gronouski's goal of lower costs and fewer employees. Freed from these qualifications, they say, the ZIP code system might well deliver on Mr. O'Brien's recent promise of "overnight mail delivery from any point in the Nation."

But until that day, in small hamlets across the country similar to Rochester, men like Mr. Overmyer would be more than happy if they could get overnight delivery to towns just across the nearest hill.

Extend GI Bill Benefits to Vietnam Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, there is growing sentiment in this country for Congress to look into the matter of providing some form of special recognition for our military veterans returning from Vietnam.

Recognition similar to the GI bill for veterans of World War II and Korea.

Carl Zimmermann, director of news and public affairs for WITI–TV in Milwaukee, editorially commented on this subject on December 28. Since WITI is a major news voice in Wisconsin, this editorial should be of particular interest to Congress. I do, therefore, request that it be printed in the RECORD:

EXTEND GI BILL BENEFITS TO VIETNAM VETERANS

It's a warm, good feeling to see all the things that are being done for our fighting men in Vietnam. Like Operation Christmas Star, in which thousands of Americans sent packages of presents to those serving the cause of freedom in southeast Asia. You can be sure this thoughtfulness by the people at home will mean so much to the men in uniform over there. And this was only one example of many programs still underway.

Yet, there's more that should be done. To truly award those men for the sacrifices they're making, we need early approval of a new GI bill of rights. The individual Vietnam veteran makes the same effort in the defense of our country as any of the men who served in World War II or Korea.

You can't minimize the Vietnam fighting by the hundreds of thousands of men we've committed by telling them this is not a real war, not a "declared" war. Try explaining that technically to the man pinned down by machine gun fire, or the man hopelessly surrounded by Vietcong guerrillas. No, he's fighting as valiantly and with the same dedication as the men of those officially "declared" wars, and deserves the same benefits.

The most important part of the original GI bill was the provision for advanced education. If we can open the door of our universities and colleges for the men returning from Vietnam, we are not only helping that individual serviceman, we're enriching our entire country. What better investment in the future?

TV–6 feels that investment should be assured. Let's tell our Representatives in Washington we want to see our Vietnam veterans receive the benefits of a new GI bill of rights.

Life in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, recently a missionary and his family from the Church of Christ, Royal Oak, Mich., returned to the United States after 21 months of living daily with danger in Vietnam.

In a letter to me, the Reverend Maurice C. Hall outlined the steps he believed our Federal Government should take to end the war there.

Reverend Hall, his wife and his son intend to return to Vietnam in March, despite the fact that they had to live behind barbed wire in constant fear of terrorist attacks. As long as our Nation continues to produce families with the courage and the dedication to God and country that this family has so amply demonstrated, we should have no doubt about the future.

For the benefit of my colleagues, the letter from Reverend Hall follows:

CHURCH OF CHRIST,
Royal Oak, Mich., December 15, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM BROOMFIELD,
Member of Congress, State of Michigan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROOMFIELD: I am a missionary of the Churches of Christ and served in South Vietnam for the past 21 months. Presently, due in part to a general buildup of nervous tension, especially by my son Ronnie, 9 years of age, we are home on a brief work furlough.

During World War II, I served in the European and South Pacific campaigns, rising to the rank of captain. However, I make no claim to being either a religious, political, diplomatic, or military expert. I simply desire to express my opinion as an individual American citizen sincerely concerned with the welfare of every human being; regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

On the whole, I support your policies in Vietnam. Nevertheless, permit me to humbly call to your attention a few matters I believe most pertinent to the conclusion of a just and lasting peace.

First, and I believe you are aware of this, the enemy we are dealing with is entirely different from anyone we have ever met in America. He has no concept of individual rights or human dignity. He is obsessed with the lust for power and world domination by the atheistic Communist state. To this end, any means is justified in his twisted mind. Any agreement is kept by him only as long as it is to his advantage.

I would suggest a tight blockade of all North Vietnamese ports; including mining, naval and air patrol. (This, of course, would be publicly announced so no one could criticize any resulting ship loss.) There should also be naval bombardment, at least of Haiphong.

An increase in the bombing targets to every vital supply line and industrial center.

This to include Hanoi, after, perhaps, a 30-day grace period for the Vietcong cessation of shooting.

Also, the increase, as rapidly as practical, of man and firepower, limited only by necessity for complete and total victory. I prayfully make this recommendation with my eldest son serving as a marine in South Vietnam.

The defoliating of jungle areas that afford refuge and protection to the Vietcong.

The bombing of any country's supply routes that provide and/or permit transportation of Vietcong troops and/or supplies.

The immediate reclassification and induction of everyone, within the legal age limits, participating in public demonstrations and/or distribution of material detrimental to morale and the prosecution of the war effort.

A promise of use of every effort of your good office to expose congressional Members (especially, those experts who have spent a couple of days in officers' clubs while on a self-edifying Vietnamese tour) whose conduct and public statements impede the war effort.

I humbly submit these viewpoints for your consideration.

Yours very sincerely,

MAURICE C. HALL.

History Will Award McGeorge Bundy an Honored Place

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished American will soon leave the Government for private life after a unique period of service to two Presidents and to his country.

None but those two Presidents, at this stage, can know how very valuable McGeorge Bundy's service to his country has been. History, however, will award him an honored place in our Nation's hall of fame.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two assessments of Mr. Bundy's work in the Appendix of the RECORD. One is the column by Mr. Joseph Alsop, as published in the Washington Post, December 10, 1965, and the other an editorial in the same paper of the same date:

MATTER OF FACT: AN ERA ENDS

(By Joseph Alsop)

Now that McGeorge Bundy's prospective departure from the White House has been formally announced, it is worth asking what gave this remarkable man his remarkable influence and leverage.

He is, to begin with, a man with rather strongly marked personal traits. He is youthful, both in his zest and his appearance (which probably prevented him from becoming, first, president of Harvard and, later, Secretary of State. He enjoys pleasure, loves good company, likes simple jokes, and has a remarkable capacity for friendship.

He is also oddly puritanical, in an old-fashioned Bostonian way; and the fact must be faced, he has a certain Philistine strain. (The arts and even the more abstract learned disciplines, like archeology, may well suffer slightly while he remains at the head of the Ford Foundation.) Add that he does not suffer fools gladly, and if these be flaws, you have the full list.

As can be seen, however, the notion of these superficial traits by no means offers an explanation of Bundy. Nor is his role explained by the opportunity that was given to him by President Kennedy's decision to be his own Secretary of State. What he did with that opportunity is the measure of the man, and it is this that needs to be explained.

The explanation, clearly, must begin with his strong disinterestedness and deep sense of public duty. It may be asked, of course, how a man can be disinterested who is also so obviously ambitious and so evidently enjoys the exercise of power.

But the answer is that a public servant who is not ambitious and does not enjoy the exercise of power is at least a flawed if not an entirely useless instrument. A hesitancy in the face of power was in fact the flaw in the late Adlai E. Stevenson. Disinterestedness merely consists in putting public duty before ambition, whenever circumstances may require this disagreeable choice.

This kind of disinterestedness Bundy has more than amply proved he had, not least when President Johnson was making his painful but courageous basic decision about Vietnam. To this basic quality, Bundy adds two others of essential importance—the courage to face hard decisions without boggling at the consequences and the energy to do an inordinate amount of daily work.

His power to work alone would have been sufficient, all by itself, to set Bundy apart from other men. For more than 6 years, and for 7 days a week, with only the rarest holiday interruptions, the whole foreign business of the United States of America has passed across Bundy's desk; and every detail in this enormous volume of business has been handled with brisk dispatch and orderly efficiency.

Yet one may still guess, oddly enough, that Bundy's key quality is neither in the moral category of his disinterestedness nor in the physical category of his power to get through five or six normal men's work. His key quality, in fact, is intellectual; and it may be described as simple intolerance of guff.

In a happier time, intolerance of guff could be taken for granted among the American policymakers. It was, indeed, the distinguishing mark of the heroic postwar era of U.S. foreign policy. In those days, no one of any mark (except of course poor Henry Wallace) proceeded from wishful assumptions to ridiculous conclusions.

Nowadays, however, guff rises round us like a horrid tide. Empty slogans, cheap self-delusions, glaringly obvious nonfacts, are solemnly peddled on every side and on an enormous scale. Deceptive word substitutions—"negotiations" for "surrender," for example—are the common currency of political discourse.

But Bundy, who does not gladly suffer fools, is even more intolerant of wishful assumptions, counterfeit ideas, nonfacts and verbal disguises. This characteristic has made him a good many enemies. For fools not only expect to be suffered, and not merely with patience, but with every evidence of unalloyed delight; in the intellectual realm, the counterfeiters also are wonderfully self-righteous, and hence they grow wonderfully indignant when their counterfeit is rejected.

But one cannot think of an enemy of Bundy's whose enmity is not in fact an honor. He has been a public servant in the tradition of Stimson and Root, Lovett and McCloy, Acheson and Forrestal. As these men dominated American foreign and defense policymaking in their day, McGeorge Bundy and Robert S. McNamara have been the dominant advisers of President Kennedy and President Johnson.

An era will therefore end when Bundy goes. And it must be added that President Johnson will have to search very far and very hard if he is to have equally intelligent, guff-free and courageous advice hereafter.

BUNDY'S DEPARTURE

McGeorge Bundy will have no successors at the White House—and no predecessors at the Ford Foundation. This is only to say that the former Harvard dean is a man who so puts his own imprint upon any situation that the job at hand becomes uniquely his. A full assessment of his role in two administrations will await a later estimate—and that estimate probably will have scant benefit of his own contributions to it, for he is not a "kiss and tell" public man. His method of operating is institutional—notwithstanding his individuality.

The President will have to fill the job with a different man, but beyond this, he has a different job to fill. In the Kennedy administration, Bundy was the ideal agent through whom the President could exert his direct leverage on foreign affairs. In the Johnson administration, the Bundy role altered (and in a way even broadened). His organization probably acquired an even larger role in helping to make Presidential decisions and framing up the available alternative policies. This was especially important in the first period of the Johnson administration.

No doubt Bundy's successors will have a much different charge and assuredly they will carry it out differently. In this sense, his departure closes a period and ends a relationship to governmental policy unique in American history. There will be new and different channels between the President and Defense and State Departments. These changes can occur in the loose and flexible and plastic American Government without profound constitutional crisis or political upheaval. The Government apparatus will speedily adjust to a new relationship.

When he departs from Washington in February to go to the Ford Foundation, Mr. Bundy will be able to look back upon a remarkable record of service to his country. It is gratifying to know that the President has made arrangements to make further drafts upon his judgment, wisdom and experience. Whatever institutional arrangements are made, of course, such men forever remain first at the disposition of their country. That is the impulse that brought him to Washington and the one that kept him here and the one that sooner or later may bring him back.

It's Uncle Billy Frost's 103d Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William B. "Uncle Billy" Frost of Pampa, Tex., is celebrating his 103d birthday today, and his many hundreds of friends in Pampa, the Texas Panhandle, and all over the United States are flooding him with messages of congratulations and best wishes.

"Uncle Billy" is an institution in our hometown of Pampa not only because of his personal charm but also because he is one of the true pioneers of the U.S. petroleum industry. Uncle Billy's father drilled a well in Drake, Pa., credited with being the country's first. Uncle Billy, when he was 14 years old, went to work pumping oil wells and followed the petroleum boom through fields in Pennsylvania, Kansas, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Texas before settling in Pampa, in the heart of the great Panhandle oil and gas field.

We in Pampa and the Texas Panhandle are proud to salute Uncle Billy Frost on the occasion of his birthday and, God willing, hope to enjoy his warm friendship for many more years.

Behind Those Campus Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have felt pangs of concern, even worry, relating to the campus demonstrations of recent months.

As I have mentioned to my colleagues before, it very often takes a smalltown newspaper editor to cut through the words and acts of others, to bring far-reaching events into focus.

C. W. Brown, editor of the Oconomowoc Enterprise, Oconomowoc, Wis., has done exactly that and I use this means to call one of his recent editorials to their attention:

BEHIND THOSE CAMPUS DEMONSTRATIONS

"Behind Those Campus Demonstrations" is the title of an article in the January issue of Reader's Digest, page 43, that should be "must" reading for every citizen. It was written by Eugene H. Methvin following a 5,000-mile tour across America's campuses.

The article should be of particular interest to those brilliant and sincere students who are participating in and sometimes leading these campus demonstrations. Their public image is that they are in the weird position of attending a university presumably to become educated but in fact are, without depth of actual practical experience, trying to "educate" their university.

Members of another group on the university campuses represent those who just want to join excitement.

Still another group consists of faculty members who under the guise of personal liberty indefensibly lend their influence to creating turmoil not only at their places of employment but also to the interruption and obstruction of orderly teaching of young minds the education essential to attaining the foundations for sound judgment and responsible citizenship.

It would do no good for the radical left-wing agitators to read the article. They would only gioat over the stupidity of permitting them the liberty to openly work under the cloak of the right of freedom so that they may destroy freedom itself. To those who do not believe that is the truth just read the article. There is no difference between these known Communist leaders on campuses and their counterparts that have created the Vietcong and the progressive uprisings that are increasing in Central and South America and the Caribbean area. Even in Puerto Rico, the showplace of the Caribbean in progress and liberty, they are successfully accomplishing their dirty work.

Consider that American students in India receiving U.S. Government scholarships under a program administered by the University of Wisconsin demonstrated against the American Government policy and were rude to a visiting congressional delegation which included Wisconsin's Representative in Congress, THOMSON. One editorial writer interpreted this as something to be proud of, pointing out that it is evidence that we honor the rights granted in our Constitution. American students' use of that right in India, will, in fact, be teaching Indian students and the general public to do the same thing against their own government—and if that doesn't threaten destruction to free governments in those troubled countries, nothing does. How stupid can we be? We at least ought to see that students go over there who will not exercise their rights in any such manner. It's outright dangerous to the whole effort to maintain freedom in the world. It is high time that we faced that fact.

It is fuzzy thinking when the rights of free speech are interpreted to extend to the commission of subversion and treason itself and if it isn't treason, what is it?

Second City Syndrome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the editorial of Standpoint, the editorial voice of WBBM–TV Chicago, broadcasted Thursday, December 9, and Friday, December 10, 1965. Titled the "Second City Syndrome," it is as follows:

THE SECOND CITY SYNDROME

Chicago wears the label of "second city." That's mostly because it has fewer people than New York City. And, by other normal measuring rods, it is second to New York. Less money is counted in our counting houses, we have fewer theaters, fewer advertising agencies.

We think that if we got some new, more logical measuring sticks, Chicago would measure up to the title of America's No. 1 city. Here is our case: Behind New York's glittering facade is corrosion so deep that the city is staring wide eyed at a $300 million budget deficit. New York is now paying more interest on its debts alone than Chicago is to run the whole city. While Manhattan is losing industry at a rapid-fire rate, Chicago is leading the Nation with a billion dollars worth of new plants and equipment in the last 10 years alone. And, we're known as the Nation's automation capital with one out of every seven workers in fully or partially automated jobs.

When New York's major crime rate jumped a jarring 17 percent last year, Chicago's dropped 16 percent—a note underscored by New York's recent attempt to hire our police superintendent, O. W. Wil[illegible] At the public welfare level, New York's aid to dependent children rolls have risen more than 48 percent in the last 3 years. Chicago's dropped 9 percent, the only major city in the Nation to show a decline.

St'll parched from a crippling water shortage and faced with the fact that its World's Fair was a flop, New York can cast covetous eyes on Chicago's brimming lake and booming convention business—a business that incidentally has already booked up sprawling McCormick Place for 1966, has it 80 percent booked for 1967, and 66 percent reserved for 1970. New York's per capita debt is more than $430; Chicago's slightly more than $60, the second lowest in the Nation next to San Diego.

While New York has been battling over a lower Manhattan expressway since the start of World War II, Chicago has built the Kennedy, Eisenhower, Stevenson, Dan Ryan, and Edens expressways. Still another, built on stilts, has been proposed for Chicago's West Side. And even now, as the threat of a major public transportation strike glares at New Yorkers, Chicago has ironed out a new CTA contract—at no increase in fares—and a million-dollar survey is in the works to expand our subway system by some $150 million. Chicago's port is having a record year; our airport is the world's busiest and fast becoming overcrowded. Skyscrapers—new, shiny and towering—have hoisted our skyline to new heights and they're still sprouting, evidence to a building boom that has led the Nation for the last decade.

Chicago knows how to move, and it is moving, with the same kind of "go" that makes the Chicago Bears go. But we've still got a long way to go. We have slums yet unremoved. We have racial problems yet unresolved. We have a taxation system that needs to be revised. Perhaps, most important of all, we still have Chicago citizens with a second city frame of mind.

That's where you come in. You have a right to be proud of Chicago, and a right to work to make it better, even though we think we've already captured the title of the Nation's No. 1 city in everything except numbers. Perhaps it was because, being second, we tried harder.

Resolution by City Council of Lake Charles, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, as we commence this 2d session of the 89th Congress amidst widespread and irresponsible criticism of our Government's position and policies regarding its relentless and admirable defenses against Communist aggression throughout the world and, particularly in southeast Asia, it is with great pride that I now add to the overwhelming voices of countless millions of free and loyal Americans who are in vigorous support of our Nation's stand against communism by offering the resolution of the City Council of the City of Lake Charles, La., unanimously adopted by it on November 17, 1965:

RESOLUTION 92–65

Resolution commending the American youth who offer their lives in the service of their country in Vietnam

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of the United States to be concerned about the health and welfare of all people; and

Whereas the Government of the United States has given aid to all poor and distressed nations in the world; and

Whereas it is the policy of the Government of the United States to oppose the enslavement of the weak by the spread of atheistic communism; and

Whereas our Government has sent American troops and American goods to Vietnam to help that country in its fight against communism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lake Charles, La., in regular session convened, that:

SECTION 1. The Council of the City of Lake Charles, La., recognizes the plight of this distressed nation and sends its best wishes and prayers for victory over their communistic enemy, and commends the American youth who offer their lives in the service of their country in Vietnam, for their devotion to the ideals of democracy, their dedication to the principles of freedom, and their sacrifices and suffering to prove to the world that the American way of life is a treasure that all mankind should seek.

DAN WISE,
President of the Council.

Attest:

JUDY TRAMMELL,
Clerk of the Council.

Fairness in Phoenix

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, the ability of a free press to keep a tight rein on the excesses of a powerful central government has been one of the keystones of our American system.

In the forefront of this continuing service for most of his life has been a Hoosier editor and publisher, Mr. Eugene C. Pulliam.

Eugene Pulliam, of Indiana, is one of the real giants in the field of newspaper publishing, and the people of our State have benefited from the efforts and service of Gene Pulliam for many years.

The two largest newspapers in our State, the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis News, as well as the Muncie Star and the Muncie Press, are products of the Pulliam drive and initiative.

There are no finer or more respected newspapers in the United States than the four papers I have mentioned, and central and east-central Indiana owe a great deal of the current prosperity and well-being to the works of these outstanding publications.

Fearless and responsible journalism are a Pulliam trademark and have contributed greatly to the success of his enterprises. The Pulliam credo that public office is public business has brought our State a brand of journalism and a standard of publishing excellence unequaled in the Nation.

All Hoosiers are proud of the recent honor accorded Mr. Pulliam as the recipient of the 12th John Peter Zenger Award, and I wish to add my congratulations to his achievements. An article in the January 7 issue of Time magazine also featured the accomplishments of Mr. Pulliam.

In order that all Members of Congress be apprised of the tremendous contribution to our Nation by Mr. Pulliam, I offer, under unanimous consent, the Time magazine article, and a story from the front page of the Sunday, January 9, issue of the Indianapolis Star.

The articles follow:

[From Time magazine, Jan. 7, 1966]

FAIRNESS IN PHOENIX

A few years back, a joke was making the rounds of Phoenix. Publisher Eugene C. Pulliam asks one of his managing editors: "What did Barry Goldwater say today?" The editor replies: "Nothing." "Fine," says Pulliam. "Put it right on page one, but keep it down to two columns."

Times have changed. Goldwater is very cool to his old friend Pulliam these days. And Pulliam's papers, the Arizona Republic and Phoenix Gazette, have lost their partisan image and greatly improved and broadened their news coverage. This week Pulliam receives the University of Arizona's John Peter Zenger Award[1] for distinguished service in support of freedom of the press and the people's right to know. (Among previous recipients: the New York Times' James Reston and Washington Post Editor James Russell Wiggins).

Pulliam's papers, the only two dailies in Phoenix, no longer play up only the conservative view of news and dismiss what is distasteful to them. Now they give equal space to varying shades of opinion. The editorial pages not only support Democratic Senator CARL HAYDEN as well as Republican Senator PAUL FANNIN; they also balance liberal columnists, such as Walter Lippmann, against conservatives, such as William Buckley. Morale was once so low that innumerable staffers quit in disgust, and many were fired. Now, Pulliam runs a happy shop. "We are all Pulliam's babies," says one veteran staffer, actually brushing away a tear.

ON THE MERITS

Of the two papers the morning Republic (circulation 156,000), has changed more dramatically than the afternoon Gazette (100,000). In the last 4 years, the Republic has boosted its reporting staff from 65 to 100, stationed 1 reporter in Vietnam while others roam the globe. Arizona staffers have delved into such topics as poverty, the new math, smog, pornography, and corruption in the State tax commission. The paper fought successfully to save nearby scenic Camelback Mountain from private developers.

This new look in newspapers is not unique to Phoenix. Papers across the United States are no longer reacting to issues in quite so ideological a way; instead, they confront each issue on its own merits. Still, much of the improvement in the Pulliam papers can be chalked up to Pulliam himself, who has always been portrayed as more of an intransigent conservative than he actually is. At 76, Pulliam is one of those publishers who is a newspaperman first. "Why in hell," he asks, "should a man want to sell newspapers? If I wanted to make money, I'd go into the bond business. I've never been interested in the money we make but in the influence we have."

The son of a Kansas Methodist missionary, Pulliam attended DePauw University, later joined the Kansas City Star. At 23, he gave up working for a newspaper to buy one: The Atchison (Kans.) Champion. From then on, he bought and sold papers until he built up enough equity to land four that satisfied him: the Indianapolis Star in 1944, the two Phoenix papers in 1946, the Indianapolis News in 1948. Deeply in debt, Pulliam kept nervously reshuffling his staffs for several years and baldly promoting his conservative opinions. But after gaining confidence, he decided that his papers were too doctrinaire even for him. He began to give all of his papers more freedom, and in 1960, when J. Edward Murray lost his job as managing editor of the Los Angeles Mirror, Pulliam invited him to Phoenix. "I'm no pink," Murray told Pulliam, "but I'm too liberal for your blood." Pulliam disagreed and put him in charge of the Republic.

AN AVERSION TO POWER

Murray encouraged staffers to think for themselves and stop trying to read Pulliam's mind. He slugged it out a few times with Pulliam over issues, but mostly the two have seen eye to eye. Pulliam's papers supported Goldwater for President, but lukewarmly. "It isn't fair to the Democrats to give him extravagant support," Pulliam told Murray. "He is not a superman, and I don't believe in supermen." Murray hastened to agree. "The old conservatism is changing into a new sophistication in Phoenix," and the papers must guide the town.

The Pulliam papers now exert so much influence that Pulliam is worried. Like other thoughtful conservatives, he fears vast power, even his own. He refuses to add special news or advertising sections to his papers to increase their sales in the suburbs. "Competition is good for us," he says. "There's plenty of room for the suburban papers. Let them live." He will not serve on company boards in Phoenix and discourages people from coming to the papers for advice on civic projects. "They should go ahead on their own," he declares, true to his individualistic creed. "We will support them if we think they are right, and oppose them if we think they are wrong."

[From the Indianapolis Star, Jan. 9, 1966]

TUCSON, ARIZ.—Publisher Eugene C. Pulliam yesterday received the University of Arizona's 12th John Peter Zenger Award and a message of commendation from President Lyndon B. Johnson.

After accepting the award, voted him by a panel of U.S. editors and publishers for "distinguished service in freedom of the press and the people's right to know," he addressed the awards luncheon sponsored by the Arizona Newspapers Association.

Pulliam called on the American people and the press to be partners in freedom in the continuing battle to protect their liberties from government tyranny.

A founder of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalism society, he is publisher of the Indianapolis Star and the Indianapolis News, a number of smaller Indiana newspapers and the Arizona Republic and the Phoenix Gazette, both at Phoenix.

Pulliam asserted that the right of the people to criticize their government is the central issue of human liberty in 1966, as it was in 1735, when John Peter Zenger's trial provided the heritage for the press' work today.

Government Should Prosecute Aptheker, Lynd, and Hayden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the press reports that the Justice Department is making a study of the violations of Federal laws which were committed by three American citizens who recently went to Hanoi. The trip was admittedly made without authority and in open defiance of law.

---

[1] Named for the colonial New York newspaper printer who was jailed for criminal libel against the British Crown in 1734. Zenger's acquittal by a local jury established not only truth as a defense against libel, but also the principle of freedom of the press in America.

The three culprits were Herbert Aptheker, Staughton Lynd, and Thomas Hayden. The alleged mission was to contact Communist authorities and discuss with them our efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the war the Communists are waging against the South Vietnamese.

Upon their return these anti-American emissaries reported in Moscow they had talked at length with the North Vietnamese Premier, Phan Van Dong, and others. Their report was hazy and meaningless. Among other things, they decided the Communists did not know about President Johnson's unconditional offer of negotiations, and the United States was at fault.

Does this conduct constitute a violation of our laws? That is the question the Justice Department is now trying to determine. If there is substantial evidence of their guilt, then it would seem that they should be prosecuted.

Press reports state the Justice Department is reviewing several laws that might be applicable to the unauthorized trip. Among them are violation of State Department travel and passport rules, sedition, treason, and an 18th-century law—the Logan Act—which prohibits negotiations with foreign powers by private U.S. citizens.

From their own admissions it would seem that they did some negotiating. Moreover, their travel in defiance of the law which requires them to clear the trip with the State Department would seem to present an open-and-shut case against them.

Federal law provides penalties of up to 5 years in prison and a fine of $5,000 for this unauthorized trip.

Mr. Speaker, these violations are serious and should be treated accordingly. At the very time that our troops are fighting and some dying in a fight against Communist aggressors, these characters go to Hanoi and give aid and comfort to the enemy.

While these three are obviously mentally, morally, and emotionally immature, they should nevertheless be made to answer for their subversive activities. Being mentally sick is in this instance not a valid excuse.

After all, who are these crackpots? Aptheker is an admitted Communist of the old Stalin school. He is an enemy of the United States. He is described as the Communist Party's leading intellectual at the Institute of the Marxist Studies in New York. He revels in bloodletting and anarchy. Of the Negro riot in Los Angeles he was quoted last September as saying: "Of course, Watts was glorious."

Lynd, an associate professor of history at Yale, is likewise a revolutionary. He was affiliated with the pro-Peiping Progressive Labor Party; and was also identified with the Socialist Workers Party and the American Youth for Democracy—both cited as subversive by the Attorney General. He led the August 9 demonstration in Washington against the administration's policy in Vietnam, and got himself arrested for violating the law.

This man once called for "civil disobedience so persistent and massive" that the President, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, and other high officials would have to resign. In a speech last September, Lynd was quoted as saying a Socialist scholar should be ready at any moment to put aside his books and devote himself "to the jugular" to bring about a better world, and added:

> I wonder whether every teacher who calls himself a Socialist does not have a duty to become a professional revolutionary.

In speaking of the march on Washington last August, Yale's professor said:

> Nothing could have stopped that crowd from taking possession of the Government. Perhaps next time we should keep going.

Thomas Hayden, the third member of the trio, is a founder of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society, and is obviously pro-Communist.

It is evident that this motley crew are all retarded intellectuals and troublemakers. They should be made to answer for their crimes.

World War on Hunger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 9, 1965, in addressing the organization meeting of the Committee on the World Food Crisis, I said that I feel it is the destiny of this country to attack starvation around the world.

Moreover, I told the dedicated people gathered for this important meeting that I am convinced this mission of our country is so urgent, its rewards to all mankind so promising, that nobody can head it off.

So deep is this conviction, Mr. Speaker, that I am now proposing a world war on hunger.

I disclosed my plans for legislation in a release to the press for Sunday, January 9. Because of the broad interest of the Members of this body in this important undertaking, and with the consent of the House, I am placing this press announcement in the Appendix of the RECORD. The press statement follows:

COOLEY TO INTRODUCE WORLD WAR ON HUNGER BILL

Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House Committee on Agriculture, announced today he will introduce early in the new session of the Congress a bill opening the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program.

The bill would authorize financing of the export of $14 billion worth of food and fiber in the next 5 years, over and beyond U.S. normal dollar exports of agricultural commodities.

"We live in a hungry and dangerous world," Mr. COOLEY said. "I am told that 12,000 persons die each day of starvation around the world, and many millions of people are hungry and ragged." Then he declared:

"Our humanitarian instincts, the world population explosion, and the cause of peace, demand imaginative, sound, and positive action at this time. There are two magic words in all the languages of the world—food and raiment. I am convinced that our world superiority in the production of food and fiber can be used to encourage great masses of humanity into peaceful pursuits, moving them toward self-reliance and self-sufficiency in the production of food and fiber. This should strengthen the bonds of friendship among free nations. Moreover, I am convinced that in the end bread will be more important than bullets in bringing peace to the world."

He emphasized also that such an undertaking as proposed in his bill should, in the long run, contribute substantially to the economic stability of rural America.

The new Cooley bill would establish as policy of the United States:

1. Deliberate production of food and fiber by America's free-enterprising farmers to feed hungry people and to clothe those who are ragged, in friendly nations around the world. Such relief no longer would be limited to distribution of U.S. surplus food and fiber.

2. Aids to these nations in building their own agriculture to meet the needs of their peoples.

"I am not proposing," Mr. COOLEY said, "that we remove forthwith the restraints upon farm production now operating through voluntary farm programs. If we did this, we might again find ourselves buried in surpluses. Neither do I suppose that the United States can feed everyone who is hungry around the world. But our farmers have mastered the arts of abundance and they can produce food and fiber, beyond our own needs, that can build the physical strength and morale of the populations in many places around the world where these people work in the direction of self-sufficiency in agriculture.

"It is my thought that our war on starvation and destitution should be directed to those areas where governments and people are trying to help themselves. We can supply temporary relief with food and fiber in programs to develop agriculture in many places. Moreover, we could supply fiber, food, and other aids while people in these other nations are developing harbors, transportation, storage, and other facilities, to accommodate the improvement in their own food resources.

"I caution again against anyone supposing that I propose a sudden unleashing of our total agricultural potential, for if we did this we certainly would pile up new surpluses in our own warehouses, since there are now so many places around the world that have very limited facilities for receiving, storing, and distributing food and fiber."

Heretofore the United States has shared with other nations through the food-for-peace program only the surpluses in the operation of programs designed to reduce the overabundant production of America's farms.

"I propose now, since our surpluses are vanishing," Mr. COOLEY said, "that we produce food and fiber deliberately as a matter of national policy, for sharing with those underfed and ill-clothed peoples who undertake sound programs to build up their own agricultural production and, thereby, to achieve self-sufficiency in the face of the world population explosion.

"The bill I am drafting is simple. Its major provision will be in the form of an amendment to Public Law 480—the food-for-peace law—to provide guidelines and rules for the worldwide distribution of food and fiber from our farms—this distribution not to be limited to surplus food and fiber as now provided by Public Law 480.

"The food-for-peace program has helped feed millions of hungry people in many countries. We are fortunate now, in looking toward a world war on hunger, to have the machinery and the know-how in our Department of Agriculture to undertake such a new program in combination with programs to develop the food and fiber sufficiency of countries where there now are millions of people ill-fed and ill-clothed.

"Our farmers would be the key to the whole program I envision. Their income, and the well-being of rural America, must be protected and advanced in this new undertaking. I would hope that this new program would keep millions of acres in production and employ on our farms many thousands of people who would be dislocated if we proceed with further restrictions upon our agricultural production."

The Agriculture Committee chairman said he hopes to open public hearings on the legislation early in February.

Need for a Breakthrough in Urban Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, during the last session I introduced legislation—H.R. 9200—to establish a federally supported research program designed to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new urban transportation systems. Such systems are desperately needed by our cities today. If they are not forthcoming soon the urban transportation crisis will reach unmanageable proportions.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] introduced an identical bill—S. 2599—which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CABELL], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RONAN], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STALBAUM], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WELTNER], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

In the winter 1965 issue of the Transportation Journal, published by the American Society of Traffic and Transportation, appears my article explaining H.R. 9200 and the need for new urban transport systems:

RESEARCH IS NEEDED TO DEVELOP NEW MODES OF URBAN TRANSPORT

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

Today our Federal Government is committed to substantial research to develop new transportation modes for travel to other cities by rail, to other countries by SST, and to other planets by rocket. Unfortunately, it has no plans to develop new modes for travel within our cities, just the areas where new transportation systems are needed most.

Here is what the administration is planning. It has committed $90 million over a 3-year period to develop a new system of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities. The new system, once in operation, will be a boon to the intercity traveler who neither likes to travel by automobile nor by airplane, but who now is discouraged from taking the train because of the bumpy, slow ride he must endure.

For the traveler who does like to fly, the administration is going ahead with a program for the development of a supersonic plane which when operational in the 1970's will travel at speeds between 1,800 and 2,000 miles per hour. The total project will cost an estimated $1 billion or more, a substantial portion of which will be in Federal funds. A great asset to the intercontinental traveler, the SST will also insure that the U.S. aircraft industries continue as makers of the most advanced planes in the world.

Finally, for the ultimate in travel the Federal Government has committed itself to developing a transportation system for sending a man to the moon—at an estimated total cost of $30 billion in Federal funds. This program is fine for boosting our international prestige and advancing scientific understanding. It, like the others however, does little for the urban traveler.

What the urban traveler needs most is a transport system what will carry him about the city rapidly, safely and economically.

The transportation problems confronting our cities today is extremely serious. People are forced to rely primarily on automobiles. As a result, city traffic is highly congested. It is a long and frustrating experience to travel from one part of a metropolitan area to another. Where public transportation does exist in the form of a bus or subway system, the urban traveler rarely can go from origin to destination without transferring or walking some distance to complete the trip.

FEDERAL RESEARCH PROGRAM NEEDED

In response to the need for better urban transportation systems, I, along with 20 other House Members, have introduced legislation in the 89th Congress amending the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide an additional $10 million a year for each of the next 2 years—or the remainder of the life of the program[1]—earmarked exclusively to carry out a research program to achieve a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of transportation for the city traveler.

From discussions with a wide variety of transportation experts, I know that the technological expertise for developing the new modes is available in our universities and in industry, and what is needed is a Federal incentive to bring this expertise to bear on the problems of urban transport. At the same time, under this program, other available talent could be put to work on the analysis of social and economic problems confronting our cities as they relate to transportation. For instance, a report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., for the Department of Commerce on new ground transportation technology that might be used between now and 1980 suggests that the city traveler wants a transport system which retains the individual freedom now available to him in the automobile.[2] The research program I have proposed, besides developing the new system itself, could also study the attitudes of people toward various different modes.

SHORTCOMINGS OF PRESENT SYSTEMS

Present-day urban transportation systems, heavily oriented around the automobile, leave much to be desired. Here are some of their drawbacks:

Air pollution

Automobiles are the chief cause of the air pollution which hangs over our cities. The result of the air pollution is that the city dweller is more subject than his country neighbor to all types of respiratory diseases.

One substance from automobile and diesel exhaust that becomes a part of the air is a hydrocarbon known as benzpyrene, which tends to induce cancer. Motor vehicles are also a principal source of carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen, both of which have varying degrees of ill-effect on health. The consequences in large metropolitan areas can be serious. Breathing New York City air, for instance, is like smoking two packs of cigarettes a day.[3]

The problem could have even more serious long-term consequences. An expert on air pollution, Prof. Morris Neiburger, of the University of California at Los Angeles, predicts that polluted air may well doom humanity within the next century if steps are not taken soon to replace the automobile with a vehicle propelled by a system other than the internal combustion engine. Dr. Neiburger maintains that devices to eliminate exhaust from cars will not be adequate and as the population expands and living standards rise, increasing numbers of people—not only in America but in countries where the automobile is now a rarity—will acquire and drive their own cars. He has said, "the world's atmosphere will grow more and more polluted until, a century from now, it will be too poisonous to all human life to survive, and civilization will pass away."[4]

A good urban transport system could greatly reduce air pollution.

Traffic congestion

A commuter taking the bus to work may spend 45 minutes or more traveling a few miles from home to office. If he drives his car he may move more rapidly, but he has the problem of parking it and every day upon leaving work he runs the risk of being caught in a monumental traffic snarl. The greatest of these—to date—clogged the streets of Boston for 5 hours on the evening of December 30, 1963.

Heavy traffic, too, is a danger as well as a frustration to the individual, whether he walks or drives. The National Safety Coun-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

cil has reported that in 1964 there were 14,500 deaths from motor vehicle accidents in urban areas and 980,000 personal injuries.

A good urban transportation system could make city travel much safer.

High costs

Whatever his personal choice of transportation, the city dweller pays more than he realizes for the present commuting patterns heavily reliant on roads and freeways. Not only does he pay between 10 and 12 cents a mile to drive his automobile to and from work—or half this if he goes by public transportation—but taxes on property, gasoline, and other items are higher than they might be because of the expense of constructing urban freeways, usually at the cost of $10 to $15 million a mile.

In addition, the cost of accidents is high, raising the price of insurance policies. The National Safety Council reports that damage bills for all urban accidents in 1964 amounted to $4.6 billion, with property damage accounting for over half, or $2.6 billion.

A new urban transport system, more efficient and cheaper to build than those we now have, could cut costs, both for the individual and for the city.

Urban planning

Because our cities' transportation systems are dominated by the automobile, highways are often the predominant structures in urban areas, creating ugly sites and taking up valuable real estate. Also, once the cars are downtown, they must be parked while their drivers work or shop, thus taking up more valuable land.

City planners now have little choice but to build freeways. They are pushed by the demands of travelers who want their own cars, and pulled by the Federal grant-in-aid program that gives States 90 percent of the cost of constructing freeways.

A good urban transportation system, more desirable than the automobile, would free the city from its shackles to the expressway and provide an opportunity for better urban planning.

Good public transportation would bring other advantages to the city. If the system were automated and the vehicle traveled on restricted guideways, it could be used for carrying cargo other than passengers during nonpeak hours. In the early morning, the system could be closed entirely to passenger travel while goods were distributed about the city. Special containerized vehicles carrying goods to downtown stores could, in the period of a few hours, replenish the shops entirely. Thus it would be unnecessary for trucks to clog central city streets during the day, thereby making the downtown area more enjoyable for the pedestrian.

The practice of supplying the stores might also be reversed so that those orders taken by merchants during the day over the phone could be delivered to decentralized distribution points in the early morning hours. The next day the housewife could have all her deliveries presented to her door in time to free her for other activities that day.

ALTERNATIVES TO HIGHWAYS ARE POOR

Cities today have no sensible alternatives to building massive urban highway systems. They can turn to the conventional modes of public transportation, but these, too, have their shortcomings. Subways, like freeways, are expensive to build, costing up to $20 million a mile where the underground area is not already utilized for other public services. Buses are little improvement over automobiles, since they still contribute to air pollution, cause traffic congestion, and can also run into other vehicles or pedestrians.

If a city does decide to develop a conventional public transportation system, it has little help available to it outside its own financial resources. The Federal program authorized by the Mass Transportation Act of 1964[2] and now administered by the new Department of Housing and Urban Development is modest in scope and funding, with the result that only limited benefits fall to the city. The act carries a grant authority of $375 million over a period of 3 years to pay two-thirds of the cost of establishing new urban transit systems or making improvements on existing ones. Since it would cost an estimated $10 billion to properly equip our Nation's cities with conventional modes of public transportation, the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is no more than the proverbial drop in a bucket.

The program, thus, is not designed to bring about the needed revolution in urban transportation. All it can do is help some cities hold the line a while longer with obsolescent systems which some day will have to be supplanted or supplemented if the city's residents and workers are to maintain any meaningful degree of mobility.

The 1964 act does contain a provision which authorizes the expenditure of $10 million a year, out of the total authorization of $375 million, for research, development, and demonstration projects in all phases of urban mass transportation.

Because the pressures on the whole program for help in providing more buses and subway cars are considerable, the administrators of the program have made the decision for the time being to apply all of the $10 million for research, development, and demonstration to the demonstration of already developed systems.

ONE NOVEL IDEA—THE COMMUCAR

Amending the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide another $10 million annually exclusively for research and development of new modes of urban transport would complement the existing program by preparing for the greater demands for good public transportation which will most certainly develop as our urban areas continue to swell in population.

The research program would focus on developing systems which were fast, safe, and economical, do not pollute the aid, and satisfy the apparent need of people for individual transport while at the same time make good city planning possible. The program would be able to capitalize and improve upon the numerous ideas which already have been put forward for new systems of urban transport, among the most imaginative of which is the commucar, developed by a group of students and faculty at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The commucar is a small, lightweight vehicle capable of carrying up to four passengers. It can be driven independently under its own electric power or along public guideways, getting its electricity from a side rail. On the guideway, the vehicle is controlled by a computer system which takes its passengers directly to their destination without transfer. Under its own power, a commucar could travel about 50 miles an hour, while on the automatically controlled guideway it could travel as fast as 100 miles an hour. Since the system would be automated, the density of traffic along the guideway would be much greater than along freeways, while at the same time the possibility of accidents would be greatly reduced.

Because the vehicle is compact and light, it could be easily parked. Because it could be automatically controlled, it could be put back on the system, driverless, to be used by another commuter or shopper. Thus it would be possible either to own the vehicle or merely to rent it for a trip downtown. And the system might be adapted for use, as suggested earlier, for transporting goods about the city.

The commucar is only one of many ideas that could be developed and demonstrated under a federally sponsored research program.

Another proposal, quite similar to the commucar, is the starrcar—for self-transit rail and road car—devised by the Alden Self Transit Systems Corp. of Westboro, Mass.

Still a third proposal is the teletrans, a system of individual vehicles which, unlike the commucar and starrcar, are confined to guideways running either underground or in enclosed tubes supported above streets by metal arches. Powered by electricity and entirely automated, the teletrans vehicle is designed to run at an average speed of 45 miles per hour. Stations, sidetracked off the main course, are spotted along the guideway approximately every half mile. Since the vehicle would not have to go through each station, the trip would be nonstop, and since the entire system would be automated with the destination of the vehicle set by computer before the passenger embarked, no transferring would be required. This system has been under development by the Teletrans Corp. of Detroit, Mich.

TRADITION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

It is by no means alien to Federal policy to use technology derived as a part of a concerted national program to develop a service of benefit to the general public. The Manhattan project, for example, one of the greatest Federal undertakings of all time, resulted in nuclear power for civilian use.

Like it is doing in the supersonic transport and high-speed ground transport projects, the Federal Government would join in the development of a transport system that will benefit everybody. Once the system is operational, the Federal Government would release it to private firms who would then produce and operate it.

Such a research program, although federally sponsored, would in all likelihood be carried out jointly by universities and industry with the most up-to-date technological expertise. The electrical industry, for instance, could develop the systems which will guide the vehicles from origin to destination, and the automobile and aerospace industries could design and construct the actual vehicles.

Today nearly 75 percent of our population lives in cities. By 1980 nearly 80 percent of all Americans will be living in urban areas. This 80 percent—over 200 million—will have to get about the cities for the ordinary events of day-to-day living. They will need a system that will be quick, safe and economical, which does not pollute the air, and which fulfill their desire for individual transport while at the same time making good city planning possible. This is the system that can be developed under a federally sponsored research program.

---

[1] H.R. 9200, introduced June 17, 1965, 1st sess., 89th Cong. Members introducing identical legislation are as follows: THOMAS L. ASHLEY, of Ohio; EARLE CABELL, of Texas; LEONARD FARBSTEIN, of New York; DONALD M. FRASER, of Minnesota; JOHN J. GILLIGAN, of Ohio; Mrs. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, of Michigan; SEYMOUR HALPERN, of New York; CHARLES S. JOELSON, of New Jersey; CLARENCE D. LONG, of Maryland; RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, of New York; JOSEPH G. MINISH, of New Jersey; WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York; DANIEL J. RONAN, of Illinois; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, of New York; LYNN E. STALBAUM, of Wisconsin; Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, of Missouri; CHARLES A. VANIK, of Ohio; CHARLES L. WELTNER, of Georgia; and SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois.

[2] Connell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., "A Projection of Technology Applicable to the Future Highway System of the Boston-Washington Corridor" (Buffalo, N.Y., Oct. 2, 1964), CAL Report No. VJ-1913-V-1; Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.B, 166-878, p. 164.

[3] Council of the City of New York, "Air Pollution in New York City," June 22, 1965, Publication No. M-970, p. 26.

[4] Washington Post, Aug. 9, 1965.

[5] Public Law 88-365, July 9, 1964.

Gemini Feat Puts United States in Space Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of December 17, 1965, well describes the current status of our manned space program. The brilliant achievement of rendezvous of Gemini 6 and 7 needs now to be followed by the docking of two vehicles. The lead which we hold in the space program, as so aptly put in this article, can only be maintained by our continued full support of our national space program. The editorial follows:

GEMINI FEAT PUTS UNITED STATES IN SPACE LEAD

The American public does not get quite as excited over space flight now as it did when the first few flights were made. To a layman who knows little about the fine details of space science, space flights are space flights. It was amazing to all of us that man was able to orbit the earth in a space capsule and return safely to earth. It still is amazing. But after it has been done more than a dozen times it is natural that public excitement should show a slight decline.

Most of us are not able to understand enough of the scientific problems to share the excitement of space scientists over proof that some intricate calculations are accurate or that some device will work under certain conditions.

PUZZLE

The flight of Gemini 7 has turned up a problem that the filling station man deals with here on earth—a dirty windshield.

The pilots have had difficulty looking out the windows, which were shiny clean at liftoff. The obscuring substance is not dust, which an electrostatic field might have collected, but a kind of film, as if it were oil or grease.

That raises the question of whether there are greasy particles in space, which nobody can answer. The substance presumably could be analyzed if it were wiped off and the wiping cloth sent to the laboratory, but reentry burns off the whatever-it-is.

Offhand it would appear the astronauts may have to send somebody outside to wipe the windshield, or else equip future spacecrafts with windshield wipers.

But when Gemini 6 and Gemini 7 accomplished their historic rendezvous in space we could be about as excited as when Navy Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr. became the first American in space or when Marine Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., was the first American in orbit. Flight Director Christopher Kraft confirms the basis for our excitement over the new feat by saying that it was "the biggest milestone since the flight of John H. Glenn,"

The Russians had put a man in orbit before Commander Shepard made his suborbital flight and had their second in orbit before Colonel Glenn made his orbit. They got the jump on us in space flight because they had more powerful rockets.

For some time it was being noted by a few that the Russians were able to make the most spectacular shows but that the Americans were proceeding with a broader base of scientific experimentation which in time would prove its value. Now there is evidence that it has.

The space meeting of two vehicles traveling around the earth at more than 17,000 miles an hour was a feat that took the utmost precision in equipment, in calculation and in execution. It also was something that had to be done before there can be a manned expedition to the moon. The Russians also have to master this technique, and they have not yet done it.

The next step is to dock, that is, bring two vehicles into physical contact. Gemini 6 was launched while Gemini 7 was in orbit. Gemini 6 went 105,000 miles on its course before the two came to within 6 to 10 feet of each other. They did not attempt a docking exercise.

This was a spectacular operation as well as an important scientific and engineering achievement. It gave America a definite lead in space.

A Private Job Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an editorial I am placing in the RECORD today entitled "A Private Jobs Corps," written and distributed by the U.S. Press Association, Inc. Although the editorial refers to the Prouty-Curtis Human Investment Act, the observation is well made that this act is not in any sense a partisan proposal. Manpower training and retraining is of such importance to our economy and general welfare that I would hope that this proposal receives bipartisan consideration as an important adjunct to our employment efforts.

The article follows:

A PRIVATE JOB CORPS

A bill to give private industry a break—specifically a tax break—on the costs of job training within industry, has recently been introduced in the House of Representatives. We find ourselves very much in agreement with the basic concept on which the bill appears to be based.

With some exceptions, of course, the Government-run job-training programs have been noted for their lack of success. And there are several factors which would seem to guarantee that job training by private industry will be more effective and also more economical.

There's the experience factor for one thing; private industry has been giving job training in one way or another ever since the first master craftsman took on his first apprentice. There's a more definite purpose in a private industry's training program, and an interest in high-quality training, because a company knows just what skills its workers need. It wants to be sure that the trainee can do work that will meet company standards. About the only way a Government-run job-training program can readily measure its performance is by the number of people pushed through the course. The number of trainees, rather than the quality of training, happens also to be the basis in a Government program for hiring additional instructors and raising the pay of the director.

Although this new bill to encourage job training in private industry was introduced by a group of Republican Congressmen, it doesn't strike us as being in any sense a partisan proposal. We're confident that, given the chance, private industries will do far better at job training than any Government agency has done or can do, for the simple reason that a private employer wants to train a man to do a job, not just to get one.

It's been our observation that the man who can really do a job rarely has to worry about where to get one.

Statement by Latvian-Americans of Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement adopted by Latvian-Americans of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts on November 14, 1965, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia.

I am sure all right thinking Americans and freemen everywhere join in the sentiments expressed in that fine resolution regarding restoration of freedom and self-determination for the Baltic States and indeed for all of the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY LATVIAN-AMERICANS OF DETROIT

The American-Latvians of Metropolitan Detroit, assembled at the Detroit Institute of Arts, 5200 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich., on the 14th day of November 1965, to commemorate the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Latvia, unanimously agreed to issue the following statement:

1. As we pause today to observe the 47th anniversary of the Republic of Latvia, we again thank the U.S. Government for refusing to recognize the forcible seizure by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. We urge that this policy be continued.

2. We would like also to thank the U.S. Congress for passing House Concurrent Resolution 416 which asks that the world opinion be mobilized to the end that the Baltic States be restored to the family of free nations. We heartily support this resolution and we hope that the question of the Baltic States will be brought before the United Nations.

3. We urge favorable action by the U.S. Senate on Senator THOMAS J. DODD's resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) which calls for the right of self-determination for the Baltic States and free elections in those Communist oppressed countries of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

4. We join with our fellow Americans in urging passage of Congressman JOHN D. DINGELL's resolution (H. Con. Res. 332) that

would establish a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations.

5. We oppose the ratification of the treaty with the Soviet Union to establish consulates in the United States. Passed experience shows these offices are nothing but nests of spies and centers of subversion. We also fear that the Soviet consulates in the United States will be interpreted as American recognition of the Soviet seizure of Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania.

6. As Americans of Latvian descent who have seen the evil methods of communism in our native land, we view with alarm the demonstrations against American involvement in Vietnam, carried to the extent of even trying to stop American troop trains. We feel that a blow against communism anywhere in the world is a blow struck for America, for Latvia, and for freedom. We cannot understand how Americans, born and reared in liberty, can use their freedom in such a manner as to destroy their freedom and we fully support the policies of the President of the United States. We are solidly behind American Armed Forces fighting the free world's battle.

7. We deplore the continued attempted *russification of Latvia* by the *Soviet Communists.* The purpose of this is nothing more than genocide, the destruction of a nation and imposition of foreign colonial rule. We pray that God will give strength to our brethren in Latvia to maintain their resistance aaginst the terror that stalks Latvia.

Done in Detroit, Mich., this 14th day of *November, A.D., 1965.*

Press and Public Misled on Christmas Truce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, on December 31, 1965, the Los Angeles Times carried a column by Ruben Salazar entitled, "Press and Public Misled on Christmas Truce."

In view of the mounting gravity of the situation in Vietnam and the right of the press and public to know about the effect of administration policies, I believe this article will be of interest to many.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the column for inclusion in the Record:

Press and Public Misled on Christmas Truce

(By Ruben Salazar)

Saigon.—Tet Nguyen Dan, the Vietnamese lunar New Year, comes January 21 this year, and with it a new cease-fire crisis.

The year 1966 being the Vietnamese "Year of the Horse," it is hoped that some horsesense will be used by our side in dealing with the touchy and emotional subject of a Vietcong-inspired cease-fire proposal.

For the Vietcong have again taken the initiative by tantalizing the war-weary world with a 4-hour cease-fire proposition on the most important Vietnamese (North and South) holiday.

It is doubtful that we can afford to pass up the proposal even while ignoring it officially.

As we did after the Vietcong Christmas cease-fire proposal, we will undoubtedly come up with a better plan, a more sincere suggestion, a more practical solution.

But with all our Madison Avenue training, all our alleged propaganda knowhow, we may botch it again—as we did during the Christmas cease-fire fiasco—just for the sake of sentimental and cheap publicity.

For it has now been established that our Government decided not to let us know the hard facts on Christmas Day. It apparently felt that the truth is more palatable the day after.

And that is why such headlines as "Christmas Sun Rises on Peaceful Vietnam" ran in newspapers across the United States on Christmas Day.

Reporters here will not soon forget that as late as midnight Christmas Day (Saigon time), U.S. information officers were still telling us that there had been "some minor cease-fire violations by the Vietcong Christmas Eve and Christmas Day but that they were probably due to misunderstandings."

Once the magic day of Christmas had passed and the more mundane December 26 had arrived, however, the officers changed their tune.

The official U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam (MACV) press release for the 5 p.m. briefing December 26 reads:

"The Vietcong resumed hostilities with a vengeance by hitting outposts and district headquarters, sniping and small arms attacks, and continuous harassing action all over the Republic yesterday (Christmas).

"There was a total of 84 significant initiated incidents reported during the period 6 p.m. December 24 and 6 a.m. today, December 26."

Twenty of these incidents, we were finally *told on December 26 happened between 6* p.m. and midnight on Christmas Eve. (The Vietcong's cease-fire proposal had been for 6 p.m. Christmas Eve to 6 a.m. Christmas Day).

The Christmas Eve incident occurred in Binh Dinh Province where the Vietcong "penetrated Ky Son hamlet and threw grenades at local inhabitants," killing two civilians, one Vietnamese soldier and wounding five civilians and three Vietnamese soldiers.

By the time we were told at midnight Christmas Day that here had been some minor incidents, "probably due to mistakes," 26 other "incidents" such as the one in Binh Dinh Province had occurred.

Had we been told that the incidents were minor because headquarters did not know about their significance?

No. It was learned that Washington had ordered information officers here not to tell correspondents about the seriousness of the incidents "until we (Washington) determine that the incidents follow a definite pattern."

Put in English, it means that Washington had decided to play it smart and not rock the boat on Christmas Day but allow the Vietcong violations to add up and announce them dramatically on December 26.

That's why the poor information officers here had to resort—after saying the violations were probably a mistake—to such language (on December 26) as the "Vietcong resumed hostilities with a vengeance."

But, as so often happens when the Government tries to manage the news, things happen while news is being withheld that upset the bureaucratic applecart.

For while the unfortunate information officers were saying the Vietcong violations were probably a mistake, reporters in the field learned that the 1st Cavalry Division (Airmobile) had not stopped its artillery until 4 hours after our cease-fire period began and that the marines had been out on defensive patrols during that time had fought it out with the Vietcong—probably out also on defensive patrols.

And so now that we are faced with another cease-fire period during the Vietnamese lunar new year January 21, please, Washington, just give us the news as it comes.

The American public can decide how evil the Vietcong are without a dramatic announcement a day after the news has happened.

If Improvement Is the Genuine Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the subversive activities on the University of California campus at Berkeley, but perhaps some of the background and reasons for these activities can be laid at the teachings of the faculty. A recent publication reported that Steven Smale, a mathematics professor at Berkeley, has made the following statement:

> We want the Vietcong to defeat the United States for international reasons. If the United States is defeated in southeast Asia, this will help break American power elsewhere in the world. This would give *new impetus to revolutionary social change* (wars of liberation) in such places as Africa and Latin America. And if surrounded by revolutionary change, it will in turn make it easier to achieve radical change in the United States.

If Professor Smale is accurately quot*ed, it is plain to see the influence he* would exercise over the students with whom he comes in contact.

This is certainly in direct contrast to an address made by Dr. John Howard, president of Rockford College—Illinois—at the opening convocation on September *22, 1965, in which he made the following* statements relative to the activism of the present college generation:

If Improvement Is the Genuine Objective

(Excerpts from the opening convocation address, September 22, 1965, at Rockford College (Illinois) by the president, Dr. John Howard)

Activism has become a dominant feature of college life in America. A new set of circumstances now prevails. Unless the student and the professor recognize their new milieu and respond to it thoughtfully and constructively, the educational process may, with increasing frequency, be at the mercy of the unscrupulous demagogs and self-serving bullies who assert themselves in the midst of change and in the absence of firm and purposeful leadership. Serious-minded students must come to recognize that their mass actions can lay waste at least as readily as they can bring about constructive change.

I suggest three criteria by which a cause might be judged. First, is it affirmative? It takes no brains, no courage, and no special talents to criticize or destroy. Since man is imperfect, his institutions, even the best of them, are imperfection compounded, and any fool can find fault with them.

The difficulty is that as a student begins to comprehend the scope of the problems of this world, the inequities, and the injustices, he becomes understandably dissatisfied and impatient with the generations that have preceded him and with the evident failure of their methods. But before he disposes of their works and systems, he must remember that man's institutions, imperfect though they be, are the social instruments which have made possible the slow progress from isolated creatures of the wilderness to a human society of problems, yes, but also of enormous potential for human comfort and human kindness. These institutions have been slowly built by trial and error, pain, sweat, and sacrifice and should not be petulantly discarded. Room for improvement they all have, if improvement is the genuine objective.

A second basis for judging whether to take part is whether the decision is made thoughtfully or whether it is the product of emotion.

Finally, and this is undoubtedly the most critical question, Will the proposed undertaking actually serve the ends claimed for it? Everyone can respond warmly to a rallying cry of "peace," or "freedom," and consequently the rascals of the day chant the magic words even louder and more fervently than the saints. Since both goals are as difficult to attain as they are desirable, progress toward them is seldom achieved by hasty or superficial techniques. As Leo Rosten has stated, "We must learn to meet fanaticism with courage, and idealism with great care, for we must be skeptical of what is promised, even by virtuous men, but has not been proved."

A Bill To Enable the Joint Economic Committee To Combat Inflationary Price-Wage Behavior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 11916 to amend the Employment Act of 1946. This bill would help the Federal Government in its battle against inflation and enable the Congress to play a more important role in it.

Unjustified price advances and wage settlements can threaten our economic growth and stability. H.R. 11916 would help to bring an informed public opinion to bear on such wage and price increases. At the same time, it would help us avoid hasty and inappropriate steps such as imposing mandatory controls, or raising taxes or interest rates before we have achieved our national employment goals.

The bill is designed to prevent inflation stemming from administered prices and wages—price and wage levels which are determined by decisions in industries with large firms or unions, without effective restraint by competitive market forces. When such increases occur in these pace-setting industries, great inflationary pressure results.

Restrictive monetary policies have a dampening effect on the economy as a whole. But they are relatively ineffective against inflation caused by administered price increases or wage settlements.

MORE EFFECTIVE MECHANISM NEEDED

In order to stabilize prices without ending the unparalleled expansion we have enjoyed for the past 5 years, we need a more effective mechanism to operate on administered prices. H.R. 11916 provides such a mechanism. It will allow our economy to continue to grow, and it will let us continue to reduce unemployment, without our experiencing inflationary price increases.

The bill follows the same voluntary approach which the Council of Economic Advisers has used in recent years.

Since 1962, the Council has formulated wage-price guideposts which have been utilized by the President in urging industry and labor to refrain from price and wage increases which exceed the guideposts. The bill strengthens this existing arrangement by establishing a regular procedure for focusing an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases.

My proposal would enable Congress to aid the executive branch in fighting inflationary practices. Under it Congress, through the Joint Economic Committee, would participate both in establishing the guideposts and in determining whether they have been violated.

PROVISION FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS

The bill calls for the Joint Economic Committee to pass each year on the guideposts recommended to it by the Council of Economic Advisers. The Committee could hold public hearings, at which both industry and labor would have an opportunity to make their views known. If the Committee disapproved of the CEA guideposts, Congress would make the final decision on them.

Once the guideposts became effective, the Committee would be advised by the CEA of possible breaches of the guideposts which threaten national economic stability. The Committee would then hold public hearings to determine whether the guideposts have been breached, and whether such breach in fact threatened national economic stability. If it did, the Committee could make recommendations to the President or to the parties involved concerning possible actions which would be in the public interest.

These recommendations would be advisory, and would not be binding on anyone. But they would certainly be influential in restraining harmful action.

H.R. 11916 does not create any new bureaucracy. Under it, the CEA would continue to initiate the guideposts. Through the Joint Economic Committee, which is experienced at holding hearings on inflationary price advances, Congress would bring its opinion to bear on potentially inflationary actions.

THE ROLE OF CONGRESS

The American people have a substantial interest in price and wage decisions which affect the national economy. An informed public, aware of the significance of major price and wage decisions and having a standard by which to judge whether individual actions are in the public interest, can help the parties involved to make responsible decisions in the national interest.

Through their representatives in Congress, the people of the United States will acquire representation in the wage-and-price-setting process. And the mere knowledge on the part of management and labor that they may be invited to justify price or wage action before a public body would encourage more consideration of the public interest.

I hope that management and labor in the pace-setting industries will recognize the necessity for this measure. But in any case, the interest of the American people as a whole in the stability of our economy is paramount, and must take precedence over the right of any private group to take action injurious to the economy without review of any kind.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Two November 1965 editorials from the New York Times and the Washington Post underscore the need for a more orderly procedure toward inflationary price-wage increases:

From the New York Times:

After a mystifying display of internal confusion the Johnson administration has apparently decided to fight higher aluminum prices as a menace to the Government's anti-inflation program.

We share the administration's conclusion that the increases put into effect by the major aluminum producers are inflationary and thus destructive of the national interest. But the contradictory signals the White House gave the country before arriving at its decision point up the need for a more orderly system for policing the wage-price guideposts Washington has erected to protect the economy.

Such cat-and-mouse tactics are a poor way to enforce a program of voluntary economic restraint; yet they are unhappily characteristic of much of the White House approach to maintaining its hold-the-line precepts.

The country wants no mandatory wage-price controls.

A systematic procedure is needed through which the Council of Economic Advisers would give the country a full report on the economic justification for wage or price increases in strategic industries whenever their effect might be to unstabilize living costs.

The Council ought not have veto power; merely letting the public know when labor or management overreaches itself will be corrective enough. It will also guard against the apparent willfulness of the present machinery.

From the Washington Post:

What clearly emerges from the tangled tale of negotiations are the weaknesses inherent in stabilizing wages and prices by intermittent doses of moral suasion, exhortation, and occasionally, coercion.

But as the economy moves closer toward full employment, the disciplines of the marketplace are weakened and the burden borne by Government policy grows correspondingly heavier. That is why a set of rules—a uniform code that would guide Government in its efforts to restrain inflationary pressures—is sorely needed.

Rule one is that there should be a minimum of uncertainty about the Government's immediate intentions. Whatever the cause, the administration's handling of the aluminum affair has been maladroit. It opens itself to charges of disingenuousness when it disavows a connection between stockpile sales and the increase in aluminum prices. It creates an image of fickleness and indecision when it suddenly reverses its position after leading observers to believe that an agreement with industry had been reached. There is no room for uncertain trumpets in the struggle to hold the price line.

Rule two involves criteria. Admittedly the Government is given little warning of impending price hikes. But when the Government finds it necessary to act, great care should be taken to justify its position in a white paper or shorter statement. Such utterances would serve to establish standards—whether based on the adequacy of industry profits or competitive position in world markets—for the application of restraints.

Rule three deals with the crucial question of equity, the fairness of laying the restraining hand on some corporations and some labor unions while allowing others complete freedom to make inflationary decisions.

Until now the efforts to stabilize prices have centered almost exclusively in the manufacturing sector of the economy where big business and big labor confront one another in the glaring light of publicity. Yet it makes little sense to stabilize the prices of manufacturers when construction costs and the prices of services are permitted to climb. Nor has the administration always exhibited the political courage required for consistency. The outsized wage settlement in the automobile industry, coming as it did before the last presidential election, was blinked at. And little effort has been made to secure the decreases in auto prices which are clearly indicated by the guideposts.

If the twin goals of full employment and price stability are to be achieved, the Government must provide the counterweight of restraint to the market power that is weilded by business and labor. But restraints that are intermittently applied or based upon improvisations are not likely to be effective under conditions of high level employment. It is time to formulate detailed rules of the game.

It is clear that administered price increases have a substantial effect on our economy. The bill deals with these increases in such a way as to interfere as little as possible with the wage-and-price-setting processes of private enterprise. It would help relieve fears that economic growth will be further restrained by heavyhanded fiscal and monetary measures. And it would enable us to devote our energies and resources to dealing with the vital problems which confront us at home and abroad.

The text of H.R. 11916 follows:

H.R. 11916

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage behavior which threatens national economic stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that a new mechanism is needed to carry out the aims of the Employment Act of 1946 to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power (which includes the concept of reasonable price stability). Restrictive fiscal and monetary measures are appropriate and effective for controlling price and wage behavior caused by overall excessive demand. But in the absence of overall excessive demand, restrictive fiscal and monetary measures may be both harmful and ineffective. Such measures are harmful because they dampen the demand necessary for maximum employment and production. They may be ineffective with respect to individual price and wage behavior in indfistries with large firms or unions. This Act provides a mechanism for bringing to bear an informed public opinion in order to restrain such price or wage behavior when it threatens national economic stability by causing inflation.

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) to transmit to the joint committee not later than forty days from the enactment of this paragraph, and not later than January 20 of each year thereafter, price-wage guideposts which would, if observed, achieve noninflationary price and wage behavior;".

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (2), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting a semicolon, and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) to review the price-wage guideposts transmitted to it by the Council. If the joint committee determines that such guideposts are not appropriate to their purpose, it shall promptly report to the Senate and House of Representatives a bill or resolution setting forth appropriate price-wage guideposts. The price-wage guideposts transmitted to the joint committee by the Council shall take effect upon transmittal, and shall remain in effect until such bill or resolution is enacted, or until superseded by the Council. Any bill or resolution relating to price-wage guideposts shall be referred to the joint committee. Such bill or resolution shall be eligible to be reported to the Senate by the members of the joint committee who are Members of the Senate, and to the House of Representatives by the members of the joint committee who are Members of the House of Representatives; and ".

DETERMINATION OF PRICE-WAGE BEHAVIOR INCONSISTENT WITH GUIDEPOSTS

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4(c) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) to study actual or imminent price and wage behavior, in industries with large firms or unions, inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts; and to report promptly to the joint committee any such price or wage behavior which threatens national economic stability."

(b) Section 5(b) of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Promptly upon receipt of a report from the Council pursuant to section 4(c) (7) if it deems it advisable, or upon its own initiative, to hold public hearings, to determine whether price or wage behavior is inconsistent with the price-wage guideposts, and threatens national economic stability; and promptly to file a report with the Senate and House of Representatives containing its findings and recommendations of actions in the public interest to be taken by the President or the parties concerned."

Section 5 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended by redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as (f) and (g), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

"(e) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under paragraphs (4) and (5) of subsection (b), the joint committee or, on the authorization of the joint committee, any subcommittee or member thereof, may administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the joint committee or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the joint committee, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

Remarks by J. M. Bertotti, Manager, Educational Relations, General Electric Co., Gardner-Webb College Celebration Dinner, Boiling Springs, N.C., December 17, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. M. Bertotti, manager of educational relations for the General Electric Co., made a very fine address on December 17, 1965, at Gardner-Webb College located in my congressional district at Boiling Springs, N.C. Mr. Bertotti's address was delivered at a dinner celebrating the conclusion of a highly successful fund-raising drive for Gardner-Webb College.

The college is an outstanding institution of higher learning in western North Carolina. Under the able and dedicated leadership of Dr. Eugene Poston, the school is experiencing rapid growth. Gardner-Webb College is dedicated to scholarship, community servcie and to those wholesome Christian principals fundamental to our American way of life.

The speech delivered by Mr. Bertotti at the college on December 17, 1965, describes the part that fine institutions of higher learning, such as Gardner-Webb, have in our complex modern society. I believe my colleagues will find the speech to be most interesting, and I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

I am indeed grateful to Congressman WHITENER and President Poston for inviting me to join with you in this most significant day in the history of Gardner-Webb College.

When I first received the invitation to appear, I was reluctant to accept because of a real concern of the message I could bring to you.

In my work, I frequently address groups, as I did last week on Wednesday: 300 college placement officers at Northwestern University interested in industry's views of career opportunities for their students who would shortly be entering the work force.

Or, on Friday, in New York, when I addressed several hundred members of the Rubber Manufacturers Association interested in knowing about developments in the training and upgrading of employees at all levels in the enterprise from apprentice machinists to top management training.

I felt you weren't particularly interested in a discussion of General Electric's latest developments in building better turbines or toasters or light bulbs—but if I erred in that I'll be happy to stay on and conduct a second session after this one is concluded. Then—as a stroke of good fortune—and real thoughtfulness by President Poston, I received a copy of Francis Dedmond's book, "Lengthened Shadows—A History of Gardner-Webb College, 1907–56," and as I read the remarkable story of how this fine institution has come into being as the result of voluntary efforts of a group of dedicated people, it made me immensely proud to have been invited to join with you here tonight—and very humble about what I could bring that might be relevant—but the tone or direction of my remarks was quite clear, to me at least.

Tonight, I'd like to return to a short discussion of the basic principles or purposes of education—of educational institutions like Gardner-Webb College—and how we as citizens can do something to help the overall cause. This may most truly be a case of taking coals to Newcastle, because, as I said earlier, the remarkable voluntary achievements of you folks here in western North Carolina sparked these thoughts in the first place.

First, I'd like to talk a little about voluntary action by the citizens in the United States of America.

When I was studying French at Eastern Michigan University many years ago, we read De Tocqueville's "Voyage en Amerique," which I found delightful and particularly so because his trip in 1831 took him to my hometown of St. Charles in the then logging center of Michigan. Later I was to find that De Tocqueville was not an idle traveler but a most perceptive observer of democracy in action. His book "Democracy in America," published in 1835, is still a classic well worth reading. His visit occurred while Jacksonian democracy was at its height, and his comments were concerned in large part with the theme of the inevitable leveling influence of democracy and with the tyranny of majority rule. He provided such prophetic insight into the inner workings of this country, that generations of scholars have been forced to either argue with his conclusions or accept them. At least they cannot ignore them.

De Tocqueville saw the American impulse to act independently on the public business as our most remarkable trait. He marveled not so much at our economic success and our political machinery as at our tendency to handle public business directly and spontaneously.

He wrote that our associations were the key to a social system that he deeply admired. He saw the vigor, ingenuity, and enterprise of these associations, and sensed the boundless potential of their work, stating:

"The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons, schools. * * * Whenever at the head of some new undertaking you see the Government in France, or a man of trade in England, in the United States you are sure to find an association."

That was 1831, but where do we stand today?

A study by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center (1952) showed that 62.8 percent of heads of households did not take part in any formal group or organization—only 10 percent were active in two or more organizations. Small wonder that Britain's D. W. Bragan in his recently published book, "American Aspects," wrote:

"It is inevitable, even if regrettable, that the unique character of the American and of the American experiment is over."

I'm not sure that all hope is lost. Just when the situation is gloomiest, we see new manifestations of independent action in the United States. To be sure not all is good—because sometimes the independent sector, as individuals or as groups, gets involved in silly things—or even ugly unsavory acts. However, it often responds the most dramatically when the going is the most difficult.

My good friend, Richard Cornuelle of Burlingame, Calif., is one who thinks there is still time to save the day. His book, "Reclaiming the American Dream," recently published by Random House, has stirred up interest across the Nation with Look magazine, the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, the National Association of Manufacturers, and scores of others discussing its message of how the independent sector can be motivated.

Cornuelle points out that there are 190 million individuals in America, 50 million families, who group and regroup themselves in various ways: Over 320,000 churches with 118 million members; over 100,000 voluntary welfare groups which do everything from tutoring underprivileged children, to birdwatching, providing culture through operas and symphonies in over 1,200 communities, to discussing great books, etc.; over 6,000 private foundations with $14.5 billion in assets; hundreds of fraternal and service organizations with 36 million members; hundreds of labor unions with some 13 million members; 3,500 independent hospitals and thousands of other private nursing homes; 1,357 private colleges and universities enrolling 1.7 million students; 17,000 private secondary schools; 2,000 United Funds and Community Chests; over 4,755,000 business firms which contribute $2 billion annually to voluntary groups of all types, including $300 million annually for higher education.

What a tremendous force for good if we could only learn to unleash it for its optimum impact. How can we, for instance, capture the spark of independent action that not only kept a school like Boiling Springs Junior College from dying—but brought it to an exciting new life as Gardner-Webb College?

This example alone belies the observation of Bragan that "the American experiment is over."

The growth of corporate support of education is in itself a rather remarkable development. Very little in the way of corporate contributions for education had been made prior to the hearing of the A. P. Smith case in the courts of New Jersey in 1953. This historic case upheld the right of corporations to make contributions in behalf of education even though such contributions were not directly related to the interests of the corporation.

In the decade that followed, corporate contributions for education have risen steadily until they presently approximate $300 million per year—a sum greater than that contributed for any other single area including United Funds, Red Cross, hospitals, etc.

As you might expect, the word has gotten pretty generally around that corporations have an interest in education—and are making contributions of some magnitude.

As a result, a virtual stream of solicitors and special pleaders have been rapping on corporate doors across the Nation—each with his own particular cause—most of which have considerable merit. As an example, we totaled up the needs of some 100 capital fund drives launched by colleges and universities in 1963 and found that they exceeded $3½ billion—over more than 10 times the annual rate of giving for all corporations.

Naturally with such a condition before it, most business firms have had to organize and plan their contributions work if any semblance of reason is to preavil. In our case, for example, we conducted a rather complete review of our educational contributions program and developed three basic objectives that underlie our efforts:

1. The development of educated manpower through competent, inspired teaching.

2. The development of new knowledge of the type needed by industry and society overall.

3. The development of a social, economic and political climate necessary for the survival and growth of the competitive market system.

Within these three broad objectives, we have identified six specific criteria against which we evaluate each of the individual opportunities brought to our attention. Thus, we seek to support those projects which would—

Stimulate innovation and improvements in educational methods so that the funds available for educational purposes could both serve more students and provide more competent instruction.

Broaden the base of educational support, through encouraging parents, students, alumni, and other givers to assume a larger share of the overall cost of education.

Embody a multiplier element by which benefits tend to be spread or passed on to many beyond the immediate recipients of the support.

Contain elements which can make possible continuation of worthwhile activities through other types of support, with the original grants acting as seed money.

Encourage higher levels of excellence, set higher standards for achievement, and provide aid to institutions and individuals that show real promise of attaining excellence if given financial support.

Assist in achieving a better balance of superior educational offerings in all geographical areas of the Nation.

The corporate alumnus program of the General Electric Foundation is an excellent example of one activity that embodies several of these criteria. Under this program, first announced in 1955, the General Electric Foundation matches gifts to colleges and universities made by employees of General Electric up to a maximum of $2,000 per year. This program has now been adopted in one form or another by over 300 other business firms and foundations, thus contributing greatly in helping spread the base of support to our educational institutions.

An estimate by the CFAE indicates that this one project has resulted in over $43 million in new funds being made available in the last 10 years—and the current rate of contributions is in the order of $7 million annually.

Next week, we will announce a new step in our own program by which we will make all 280,000 of our employees eligible for participation in the program so that any gift to any institution is eligible for matching, whether the employee attended that institution or not.

I spoke earlier of how impressed I was by the book, "Lengthened Shadows," how Gardner-Webb has risen to its present position from most humble beginnings—the college that wouldn't die. But where is it to go in the future?

Arnold of Rugby is reputed to have said that "no one should meddle with a university who does not know it very well and love it very dearly."

While I am tremendously impressed with the developments at Gardner-Webb College and particularly its growth over the last decade—I must confess that I do not know it very well—yet I would like to speak a few minutes about the role of educational institutions in our land today and in the forseeable future as one observer, at least, sees it. I do hope that these observations may be of some interest to you.

I can well understand the interest of all who know this institution well and love it very dearly in not wanting to stop at the present stage of development—remarkable though it has been—but to push on toward an even greater 4-year institution. And after visiting Gardner-Webb today and meeting so many of you who have contributed so much of yourselves to its current success, I feel confident you will attain this greater goal.

My great concern is that you do not sacrifice any of the factors that give your school its present distinctiveness in this stretch for even a larger place in the sun. I refer to a tradition of over 60 years—through some of the most difficult of circumstances of almost complete self-reliance on the control of your destiny.

In a day when it is almost automatic for institutions, organizations—and individuals—to turn to government, and particularly the Federal Government—for a solution to every conceivable type of problem, the proud record of Gardner-Webb in moving forward with no tax support or Federal aid is living testimony that the spark of self-reliance that De Tocqueville observed in our Nation over 100 years ago is still alive in America.

I salute you for your program whereby tuition and fees account for almost three-fourths of the total revenues needed to operate this fine institution. What a contrast to the city where my home office is based where all students attending the city university pay no tuition whatsoever regardless of the affluence of their parents and where all efforts to impose even token tuition payments are used as a ploy by the politicians to show how they serve their constituents by seeking more and more State and Federal aid rather than asking those who can well afford to pay for educating their offspring to do so.

Secondly, I was struck with the emphasis that Gardner-Webb has placed for over 60 years on preparing its students for a place of service in society. The practice of including offerings in both liberal arts education and what is commonly referred to as terminal vocational education has much merit. Unfortunately, this same understanding of the value of diverse educational approaches to meet the multiplicity of needs of society is not sufficiently understood by educators, parents, and students.

For decades, men have philosophized and debated as to the role of the university. Ortega, Scheler, Becker, and other European thinkers felt that university teaching comprised three functions:

1. The transmission of culture.
2. The teaching of the professions.
3. Scientific research and the training of new scientists.

While they had general agreement on these points, they did not, however, agree on whether these functions were to be performed by a single institution or various institutions. This debate still goes on today, and I venture will be with us for some time in the future.

Ortega, however, was disturbed by the emphasis on scientific education to the exclusion of the others. As he put it: "There is no good reason why we should try to teach the ordinary man to become a philosopher."

Today we have what amounts to a virtual obsession about more and more exposure to higher education for our young people. An obsession that appears based on the premise that such additional exposure will add considerably to a person's usefulness to society—and satisfactions to himself—regardless of his individual capabilities.

On those occasions when I have visited Europe in recent years and participated in international conferences on manpower policy and training, I have been struck with the marked differences between our attitudes toward vocational and technical type pursuits and the attitudes of the Europeans.

John Gardner summed up the problems such a preoccupation posed for us as a nation in his book "Excellence," when he stated:

"An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

Third, while Gardner-Webb is dedicated to a community-service concept, I would hope that your definition of a community would be a broad one. It is significant that America has over 2,000 institutions of higher education as contrasted to a relative handful in the Western European nations who got started in this business centuries before us. Much of this is due to the fact that education in Europe was concentrated, while in the United States it was fragmented. Thus, by as early a date as 1770, infant America had nine colleges, while England boasted but two, Scotland four, and Ireland one. Only in the last decade have Europeans begun to critically examine their hallowed traditions, i.e., the 2-track system symbolized by the 11-plus examinations for youngsters, the limiting of higher education in many respects to an elite group—and the deleterious effects of such a system on the total economy of their nations. A direct consequence has been a definite move toward the Americanization of their educational systems.

On the other hand, the very system of fragmented, community approaches to education has led to some unfortunate consequences in America. While various sectors of the United States could be quite provincial in their attitudes in the 19th century with such broad generalizations that New England was the textile area of the United States, the Deep South the area of plantations and relaxed living, Pittsburgh the steel capital of the world, Detroit the city of autos—or, more recently, southern California as the aircraft center—we no longer can base our planning on such provincialism. Our population has become mobile, our young people more inclined than ever before to seek opportunity across the Nation—or across the seas—to enable them to make their greatest contributions. Hence, a plea—don't give an inch on your principle of education as a contributor to community service. But do think broadly about what is the community that your graduates will serve.

Abraham Flexner, who probably more than any other individual, led to a much needed upgrading of medical education in the United States of America—when discussing the modern university complained that our institutions were becoming too many things. They try to be secondary schools, vocational schools, teacher-training schools, research centers, uplift agencies, businesses—these and other things simultaneously. They engaged in incredible absurdities, a host of inconsequential things. They needlessly cheapened, vulgarized and mechanized themselves. Worst of all they became service stations for the general public.

Clark Kerr, president of the vast University of California, in his book, "The Uses of the University," hits the same point when he states:

"Some picture the university as autonomous a cloister, when the historical fact is that it has always responded, but not as quickly as today, to the desires and demands of external groups—sometimes for love, sometimes for gain, increasingly willingly, and in some cases, too eagerly."

Clark Kerr, incidentally, touched on another subject of much interest when he pointed out that the university is regarded as a radical institution, when in fact it is most conservative in institutional conduct. Few institutions are so conservative as the universities about their own affairs, while their members are so liberal about the views of others. Often the most liberal faculty member in one context is the most conservative in another.

President James Perkins, of Cornell, in a series of three lectures at Princeton University only last month indicated that the questions raised by Ortega, Flexner, Kerr, and many others are still with us awaiting solution. Note these typical quotations—

On the involvement of faculty in external affairs: "It is legitimate for a university engineer to design a bridge—but not to involve the university in building it."

On the question of the role of the university: "With the faculty in orbit, students out looking for their lost identity, and administrators out setting off dynamite under foundation vaults—Who is taking care? Who is in charge?"

Again with additional thoughts on growing enrollments: "Only the most mature and self-reliant students should be admitted as undergraduates to a university campus. The student is a student. He is at the university to learn—not to manage; to reflect—not to decide; to observe—not to coerce."

I agree wholeheartedly with President Perkins when he says the student is at the school to learn, to reflect, to observe. But this also implies a commitment on the part of the institution to provide an atmosphere, and a faculty, that motivates the student in the right direction.

In too many of our institutions, the faculty is gravitating more and more to graduate education (perhaps an area where they are needed the least); to turn to research instead of teaching, to spend their time on leave as visiting professors at foreign institutions, or serving on evaluation teams for foundations or government agencies helping dispense grants. As one wag put it, the term "full professor" in many cases means full time away from the classroom.

Recently, the vice president of academic affairs of one of the Big Ten schools launched a new program aimed at strengthening the teaching at the undergraduate level of his institution embodying a five-point program of:

1. Establishing means to provide compelling reward and recognition for good, undergraduate teaching.
2. Reorienting its teaching assignment patterns to bring associate and full professors into freshmen and sophomore classes as a routine and regular thing.
3. Devising a carefully conceived, rigorous, systematic, ongoing program for the monitoring and training of apprentice teachers from among its graduate students.
4. Redoubling efforts to find more effective techniques of teaching including imaginative, fresh ways to delivering knowledge.
5. Bringing the most creative thinking to bear on the distillate of wisdom, or knowledge, that should be accommodated or integrated into the general education curriculum.

Not a bad program for any institution, large or small, old or young, if it is to meet the challenges ahead.

Like the fifth grade youngster who wrote a theme about "The World and Other Things," I've covered a number of items here this evening. If I've been too presumptive, I apologive to you—but I have been struck by a number of the unique features of this emerging institution. You have come a long way—and there is even greater promise for tomorrow. I wish you every success, but particularly that at accomplishing your goals without sacrificing any of the wonderful attributes of self-reliance that you have demonstrated.

I'm sure that Richard Cornuelle had places like Boiling Springs and Gardner-Webb College in mind when he wrote about how there were still many hopes for "Reclaiming the American Dream."

One Billion Dollars Private Capital for Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of South Carolina unanimously supports Duke Power Co.'s plans to invest $1 billion in Appalachia. The South Carolina General Assembly is unanimously supporting Duke plans for both the $210 million steamplant at Middleton Shoals and the $700 million complex at Keowee-Toxaway.

The people of South Carolina overwhelmingly support Duke's dynamic proposal. The people of the entire Appalachian region of eastern America support the Duke proposal. The Duke power generating complex when completed would use from $135 to $140 million worth of coal annually from the depressed coal fields of Appalachia. This would be good news for the unemployed coal miners.

Last year the general assembly adopted a resolution supporting the Keowee-Toxaway project. Last week, on January 6, both houses of the general assembly unanimously adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass the bill I introduced today which would authorize a retaining wall across the Savannah River at Middleton Shoals.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress and to the taxpayers of the entire country this important and timely resolution which was adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly last Thursday:

CALENDAR NO. S. 455

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the construction of a dam across the Savannah River and Duke Power Co. to construct an electric generating plant on the Savannah River.

Whereas Duke Power Co. announced plans more than 4 years ago to construct a giant 2-million-kilowatt steam electric generating plant on the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C.; and

Whereas the subject plant will cost in excess of $210 million and would be the largest steamplant for the generation of electricity in the entire world; and

Whereas to date 55 percent of all industry locating in the two Carolinas has located in the area served by the Duke Power Co.; and

Whereas such a plant as envisioned by Duke is one of the most desirable single industries that could come, not only to Anderson County, but to South Carolina; and

Whereas it is estimated that by the year 1985 the demand for electricity will exceed four times the present requirement; and

Whereas this development would require virtually no investment by the local community for service facilities nor would it require a great expenditure for waterlines, sewerage, access roads, or public facilities; and

Whereas the Duke Power Co. is merely seeking permission to build a steamplant which would furnish an abundance of inexpensive electricity and pay to Anderson County more than a million dollars each year in tax revenue and to the State of South Carolina over $5 million annually; and

Whereas this plant would provide permanent employment for a goodly number of people and during construction would provide jobs for over a thousand persons for a number of years; and

Whereas the experience of investment in those areas served by the Duke Power Co. has reflected $3 in either new or expansion of old industry for each dollar invested in the generation of electricity; and

Whereas the members of the general assembly recognize the tremendous asset such a plant would be for the future development and prosperity of the State and of its people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That for the above reasons the members of the general assembly wish to record themselves as favoring the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary in order that the Duke Power Co. may construct a dam across the Savannah River and proceed with the construction of the plant; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the president of the Duke Power Co. and to the following officers and Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from South Carolina.

A Salute to the Rural Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the diffusion of agricultural knowledge from the laboratory to the land in America has been truly a great service provided by our rural press. I want to pay tribute to the enduring dedication of agricultural magazines, rural papers and local newspapers to the science of American farming.

It is no wonder that other nations consider American agriculture our greatest success story.

The constant flow of information from the laboratory through the publisher to the producer on the farm has contributed vitally to the abundance of food and fiber that has blessed our Nation. Famine stalks in many lands that do not have the facilities for such communication with people on the land.

Our rural press must be given every encouragement to continue this invaluable service to America, and to find ways of assisting other nations of the world in developing similar systems of scientific communication.

The harsh challenges of both famine and abundance must weight constantly upon the minds of world leaders. The resolution of the enormous problems will contribute immeasurably to a lasting world peace.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I shall place in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of letters between the Agricultural Publishers Association and the Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. Orville L. Freeman. The letters follow:

AGRICULTURAL PUBLISHERS ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., December 27, 1965.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For more than 50 years, the Agricultural Publishers Association has dedicated its efforts to the service of the Federal Government, science, and the American farmer. Many of our publications are over 100 years old. We believe our contributions to the growth of American agriculture, that stands as a miracle before a hungry world, are self-evident.

This past year foreign nations have been in touch with our association and its members to study the methods used in providing farmers with a constant flow of vital information. For it is well known that many nations have technical data, but lack an inexpensive method of making it available. I, personally, have been invited to visit Europe next spring and will assist in any way I can.

The wisdom and foresight of our Government in promoting agriculture is reflected in the Second Class Mail Act of 1879 which provided low-cost distribution to periodicals, "originated and published for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or a special industry; and has a legitimate list of subscribers." We sincerely believe we have made our contributions to a special industry; namely, farming.

Although agriculture is a booming industry in the United States, we, like our customers, have not shared in the Nation's prosperity. As if to parallel the decline in farm income, our advertising revenues are 10 percent lower today than in 1957. We share your hopes and ambitions for an upsurge in farm income to the rural family between now and 1970.

President Johnson has clearly reflected the challenge, that lies ahead, in his message of November 3, 1965. Upon signing the Food and Agriculture Act, he stated, "In a time of technological revolution and rapid change, which is occurring on our farms no less than in our factories and laboratories, we must constantly look to the future. New ways must be explored to keep agriculture and agricultural policy up to date, to get the full benefit of new findings and of new technology, to make sure that our bountiful land is used to the best of our ability to promote the welfare of consumers, farmers, and the entire economy."

Mr. Secretary, we pledge our full resources in order that our farm people will continue to receive "the full benefit of new findings" and to rededicate our efforts that, through cooperation with your Department and the land-grant colleges, we can assist agriculture in reaching the new horizons you have so clearly outlined.

For your review, I am enclosing material that reflect our past cooperation and with which we shall help you lead us to new levels of prosperity.

Yours very sincerely,
JAMES MILHOLLAND, Jr.,
President.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1966

MR. JAMES MILHOLLAND, Jr.,
President, Agricultural Publishers Association, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MILHOLLAND: Thank you for your interesting letter of December 27. I assure you that the uniquely valuable service which the members of the Agricultural Publishers Association have rendered American agriculture for more than half a century is both recognized and appreciated.

I was particularly interested in your comment that people of other nations have contacted your association and its members in an effort to learn more about the methods used to provide American farmers with a constant flow of vital information. This is a highly encouraging development. On my own travels abroad it has been very plain that one of the biggest agricultural problems facing the world in its efforts to combat hunger and improve nutrition is how to close the gap which exists between technical data in the laboratory and the application of these data on the land. Whatever contributions you and your associates can make to help improve the diffusion of agricultural knowledge, especially in economically emerging nations, will be a truly great service.

Here at home we have devised policies and programs to improve farm income, revitalize rural America, take better advantage of the opportunities created by agricultural abundance, and use food and agricultural knowhow in the interests of world peace and economic development.

We have made substantial progress toward these objectives. Farm net income last year was $14 billion—a gain of 20 percent since 1960. Net income per farm exceeded $4,100—40 percent above 1960 and easily the highest ever.

More than 100,000 local and rural leaders are now working for community growth and new economic opportunity in over two-thirds of the Nation's counties.

The American people enjoy an abundance of top quality foods and spend only about 18.5 percent of their disposable income for it. Nowhere else in the world is food so plentiful and never has it been relatively so cheap. In addition, over 40 million Americans, many with low incomes, have a better diet due to expanded food distribution programs.

Agricultural exports in 1965 are estimated at $6.2 billion—two-fifths more than in 1960. About one-fourth of our exports are food-for-peace shipments that meet food needs and foster economic development in friendly nations all around the world.

New programs have enabled us to nearly eliminate the astronomical grain surpluses of 1960 and 1961. And the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 now gives us new long-term farm programs running through 1969.

On the basis of its present progress agriculture can look forward confidently to new horizons.

We expect another rise of perhaps a half billion dollars in farm income this year—with additional increases after that.

We expect accelerated progress in the creation of new jobs, new industries, new opportunities throughout rural America.

We expect further reductions in the real cost of food. By 1970 we will be spending only about 17 percent of our disposable income for food, and for a better diet too. As a result, a family of four will have $160 more a year to spend on other things.

We expect grain surpluses to disappear before 1970 and we look for substantial reductions in the surpluses of cotton and tobacco.

We expect continued growth in farm exports, perhaps as much as 25 percent by 1970—pushing exports well beyond $7 billion.

But, as President Johnson pointed out in signing the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, new ways must constantly be explored "to keep agriculture and agricultural policy up to date, to get the full benefit of new findings and of new technology." In pursuing our agricultural goals, we need, we seek, and we confidently expect the continued assistance of the magazines and rural papers affiliated with the Agricultural Publishers Association.

Again, many thanks for your letter and your promise of support in helping agriculture and rural America reach the new horizons for which it strives.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.

The 150th Anniversary of Southbridge, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very fine article on the 150th anniversary of Southbridge, Mass., by the able staff reporter, Mr. Frederick L. Welch, of the Worcester Sunday Telegram, which recently appeared in that celebrated newspaper.

This article is exceptionally well done and it is in fact a veritable historic review of the early origins of the town and much of its subsequent development.

I want to compliment Mr. Welch. The material in his article will be very valuable to me and others when we are making our own remarks on this very significant celebration of the 150th birthday of the town of Southbridge, one of the finest and most patriotic communities in the Nation.

The article follows:

AS ANNIVERSARY APPROACHES: SOUTHBRIDGE EARLY TIMES, LATER GROWTH ARE RECALLED

(By Frederick L. Welch, Telegram staff reporter)

SOUTHBRIDGE.—This is the year that Southbridge, incorporated February 15, 1816, observes its 150th birthday.

A sesquicentennial committee is now working on plans for an observance which is scheduled for May 21 through May 28.

To those who in recent years have watched and listened to heated discussions at town meetings or by members of various elected town boards and committees, it might be interesting to note that more than 4 years elapsed from the time a movement was started to form a town until the charter was actually granted.

VIOLENT MEETING

Historians confirm that the same spirit of discussion prevailed in the early days. In describing a meeting held December 6, 1814, at which an act of incorporation was drafted for a town, and a name for the new town was being determined, one historian wrote: "The discussion of this point led to greater warmth of passion, excitement, and violence than was ever before or since witnessed in this place at any public meeting. Each one brought forward his favorite name of the proposed town that one be selected from the list."

First white men in this area, according to history, appeared in 1633 when one John Oldham and three other persons came for two purposes: to spy on the Dutch, and to establish trade relations with the Indians. They traveled through Nipmuck territory and found friendly Indians in the village of Tantusque (Sturbridge-Southbridge area). After accepting Indian hospitality, they returned to Boston with beans, hemp, and lumps of lead.

The first settler appeared here in 1730. He was James Deneson who left Scotland at the age of 16, bought land in this area, and was the first white man to settle here. In the fall of 1730 he settled in what is now known as Dennison District and lived in a cave formed by rocks which is still in existence.

Legend has it that Deneson and Daniel Fiske hearing each other felling trees, first met at the banks of the Quinebaug River and felled trees to make a crossing.

CENTER VILLAGE DEVELOPED

As other settlers appeared in the area and activities increased, what was known as Center Village, now the heart of Southbridge, developed.

Communities making up the Southbridge of the 1730–33 era comprised the Center part owned by Moses Marcy, Globe Village area owned by William Plimpton and Westville area owned by John Plimpton. From Center Village to Saundersdale was owned by Col. Thomas Cheney and nearby land by John Vinton. The north side of the Quinebaug River was owned by Joseph Savin where he settled in 1733.

In 1740 Moses Marcy sold his property, now the Elm Street area, to Samuel Freeman, a blacksmith. Moses Marcy was granted an additional 50 acres in 1733 on the condition he build a grist mill by his saw mill. In 1736 Moses Marcy bought more land from the Oxford area, which adjoined his land, from Captain Papillion. By 1738 some 50 families were in the settlement.

SETTLER DROWNED

The first settler in Globe Village in 1738 was Aron Martin who, history relates drowned in March 1751, as he was fording the river.

The Quinebaug River played an important role in choosing this Center Village site for a settlement. It was pointed out that the river with its excellent seats for mills and other waterworks, are circumstances highly favorable to the introduction of useful mechanics, and rendering it a place of activity and business.

The goodness of the soil, with the excellent forests abounding with all kinds of timber for building, were also estimated as being of great value to the general plan of settlement there.

NO CHURCH IN AREA

There was no church in the Center Village area. Those attending meetings had to walk as much as 5 or 6 miles through the woods and cross the Quinebaug River on felled trees. Mothers carried their children. Some rode horseback. All this was to attend a 6-hour service in a church unheated even in zero weather except for a few foot warmers. Simple, informal dress was worn in summer to meetings. There were stocks in the rear of the church as a constant threat to those who slumbered or became restless.

This eventually led to a movement to form a separate community centering around Center Village.

The first meeting held preparatory to establishing a poll parish or town by including within its limits a portion of each of the three towns of Dudley, Southbridge and Charlton was held at the tavern house of the late Col. Benjamin Freeman early in the year of 1795.

Petitioners for the poll parish said: "We are subjected to great inconvenience by being compelled to travel 6 miles or more to enjoy like privileges (religious, political, and social relations) which would be localized if a separate town or parish was formed."

MEETING HOUSE RAISED

A meeting house was raised July 4, 1797, and finished early in 1800. The first meeting in it was on April 6, 1800. There were no pews, only loose boards for benches. It was dedicated July 4, 1800.

An art of incorporation was adopted February 28, 1801. It read: "To incorporate a number of the inhabitants of the southeast part of Sturbridge, southwest part of Charlton, and the west part of Dudley, all in the county of Worcester, in a parish, by the name of the Second Religious Society in the town of Charlton."

Jedediah Marcy April 13, 1801, deeded 1 acre and 130 rods to the proprietors of the meeting house for $1 (this included site of the present Central Baptist Church).

PETITION PRESENTED

The parish November 25, 1811, voted to form a town. A plan was prepared May 12, 1812. The petition was presented to Commonwealth of Massachusetts June 1814, with name of town left blank but the petition was rejected.

A committee from the Commonwealth viewed the land October 10, 1815, for a second time and reported favorably. A parish meeting January 31, 1816, voted "to accept the territory given us by the last court's committee for a town by the name of Southbridge."

Poll Parish had been known as Honest Town and was referred to by this name by the justice of the peace May 19, 1815. This caused one historian to write: "It may have been attached to use by someone in the old town from which we had separated in a moment of resentment at our obstinacy in not being satisfied to go some miles to meeting; it may have come from some way or barroom joker over his mug of flip, or possibly some one of our own really honest inhabitants who firmly believed that there was more true honesty here, than in any other place in this part of the country."

The names of Southbridge and Quinebaug had been considered when an act of incorporation was drafted December 6, 1814. Finally in January 1815, another meeting was held to reconsider the name. The name Vienna was considered. Vienna was reconsidered January 20 and Southbridge substituted with the understanding that if the name of Southbridge was already in use, the names of Newbury or Newbern be used. Southbridge won out.

The town voted March 2, 1837, to build a townhouse. The building was completed in 1839 at a cost of $3,809.78. The sum of $3,211.98 was received from the Federal Government for this house. (A survey in 1959 estimated the cost of a new town office building at from $360,000 to $390,000.)

Population figures and other statistics during the early years were: 1801, 450–500; 1816, about 900 persons; 1820, 1,066; 1830, 1,444; 1836, nearly 1,800; 1836, 50 dwellings within one-quarter mile of Baptist meeting house and nearly 20 dwellings in Globe.

The 1965 State census showed the population to be 19,384.

VILLAGE TRIES TO SECEDE

In 1856 Globe Village attempted to secede from Southbridge and form a separate town. History relates there "had been bitter and violent rivalry between Globers and Towners for many years."

Hamilton Street, now a major business street, was constructed in 1851.

Other streets which aided in the development of the town were constructed as follows: First road into Southbridge, built in March 1739, began at Sturbridge meetinghouse; 1828, county commissioners laid out and ordered to be constructed a county road leading from Southbridge to Dudley; 1832, present Eastford Road to Connecticut line was built; 1833, road down present Central Street across Quinebaug River toward Charlton Center; 1851, Hamilton and Worchester Streets built; 1866, Foster Street; 1883, Chapin Street.

Work was started in 1887 on construction of the present town hall. After much controversy the building was planned to house the high school. It was built on the site of the original building. The cost was about $90,000. The cornerstone was laid July 4, 1887.

Industrially, American Optical Co. has been in existence, including its early days, for 132 out of the 150 years the town has been incorporated.

It was started when William Beecher, son of a Connecticut farmer, came to Southbridge in 1826 after an apprenticeship in Providence where he had learned the jeweler's trade.

SAW SPECTACLES

He practiced this trade here 7 years before he came in contact with what was described as crude spectacles. The spectacles he saw were an imported pair as were most spectacles found in America at that time.

"I can do it better," Beecher is reported to have said to himself. He bought the spectacles and went to work.

The American optical industry was born at that moment.

Beecher retired from the business in 1862 and Robert H. Cole became head of the firm.

He hired George W. Wells, an 18-year-old Connecticut farm boy. He was to have an influence on the American optical industry as deep as that of Beecher.

Wells became so important to the company that when he decided to go into business for himself in 1869 he was offered a membership in the firm to persuade him to stay. He accepted.

The business was then reorganized to become the American Optical Co.

The company now has about 12,500 employees spread throughout this country and its foreign operations. More than 4,000 of them are employed in Southbridge. Company assets are approximately $100 million.

Hyde Manufacturing Co., manufacturers of industrial machine knives and fix-up and paint-up tools, is another long-time industry. It had its beginning in 1863 with the construction of wooden pails and boxes by Charles Hyde who came here from Brookfield although a native of Winchendon. The company was incorporated in 1875. It now employs about 225 persons.

SOUTHBRIDGE FIRSTS

First white men to visit area: John Oldham and three others in 1633 to establish trade relations with Indians and spy on Dutch.

First settler: James Deneson who settled in a cave formed of rocks during fall of 1730.

First road into Southbridge area: March 1739. Began at Sturbridge meetinghouse.

First business: Sawmill on Quinebaug River, north side, just above present Central Street bridge in 1732. Built first grist mill 1734, Moses Marcy.

First "Upright house": Built by Moses Marcy on site now occupied by Notre Dame Church, 1738. (Another source gives 1740 as date.)

First schoolteacher: Mary Manning, Deneson's barn, 1736.

First fire engine: 1820.

First aqueduct company: 1825. To provide water for new Ammidown Hotel.

First French Canadian: Abraham Marois 1832.

First librarian: Moses Plimpton. Elected January 7, 1833, social library.

First town clerk: Timothy Paige, Esq.

First town meeting: March 6, 1816.

First bank: Incorporated March 31, 1836.

First Roman Catholic mass: 1840 in a private home in Globe Village by Father Fitton, of Worcester.

First high school: 1841 in room over town hall.

First telephone: 1880. Headquarters of Southbridge Journal, four phones installed.

First sidewalks: 1877, along Hamilton, High, Maine and South Streets.

Waterworks: 1882.

Electric light system and street lights: 1887.

First Frenchman elected selectman: Joseph T. Blanchard, 1888.

First French-speaking pupil to be graduated from Southbridge High School: Alexis Boyer, 1894.

First Carnegie Medal for bravery awarded in Southbridge: Patrick H. Fitzpatrick.

First woman elected to office in Southbridge: Mrs. George W. Wells, school committee, 1892.

First Greek pupil graduated from Southbridge High School: Katna Manthue Michaeles.

Russ Lynch on Clear Writing in Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as our society grows more complex, so does our language.

Particularly in science, there has sprung up a whole vocabularly quite unknown to the layman. Most Americans find it very difficult to understand scientific writing, and are often unable to keep up with our tremendous strides in the field.

A distinguished Milwaukee journalist, Russell G. Lynch, has shed a great deal of light on the problem.

Mr. Lynch is a veteran newspaperman who has won several writing awards. In addition, he earned for his paper—the Milwaukee Journal—a merit award from the Soil Conservation Society of America. As the first full-time natural resources reporter for a major newspaper, Mr. Lynch has long recognized the serious barrier which language can present to the layman interested in scientific progress.

Last year the Department of Agriculture printed a most informative and helpful article on this problem by Mr. Lynch. Demand for the article has been so heavy that it has already been reprinted six times. As I feel it will be of great interest to Members, I include it herewith:

Linguistic Barriers in Science Writing

(By Russell G. Lynch)

Beatniks use a peculiar lingo which is meant to exclude others from their private little world. Some scientists and technologists are guilty of the same kind of snobbishness when they use jargon. The cost is a breakdown in communication which they can ill afford.

Jargon, however, is not the only barrier to communication, nor is snobbery the sole explanation for the use of words that convey little or no meaning to the average person.

Good scientific and technical terms, uncommon words, and foreign expressions or quotations—all fine in the right company—can lose ordinary readers or listeners and may even antagonize them.

A British writer, Rebecca West, who has devoted much thought to the motivation of traitors, speculates that a certain type of scientist, because of his mastery of one field, develops a kind of intellectual arrogance. She was writing about nuclear physicists, but it is likely that this type of mind exists in other disciplines and may in rare cases account for failure to communicate.

More often, it is a feeling of inferiority that compels the use of important sounding words, a lack of confidence in one's material or the presentation of it.

Sometimes the one failing to communicate may be unconscious of his fault or only dimly aware of any such responsibility. Intense preoccupation with his specialty has isolated him.

Whatever the fault may be—intellectual snobbery or arrogance, fuzzy thinking or erudite ignorance—all of the guilty ones limit their usefulness and sometimes their accomplishments, particularly if they are in public agencies and emphatically if they are teachers, at any level.

Scientists and technologists are not the only offenders. Men with less excuse, because their business is communication, are guilty.

Reporters on scientific and technological matters must guard against a common failing—writing for the specialists instead of the public. Or they may simply start using technical words which become familiar to them. An able medical reporter for a newspaper was guilty of this. "Ingest" became one of his words. A simple word that anyone should know? Ask a few people. Why not use "swallow" and be sure that every reader will understand?

Newspaper and magazine writers, particularly columnists, like to show off a bit. They substitute ponderous words for simple ones at the sacrifice of communication, and sometimes they sacrifice the specific meaning of a useful word.

"Pragmatic" has been popping up in columns and articles. It is also a currently popular word among research workers. The diverse definitions of this word, particularly its intrinsic meaning, give it little utility. What these writers usually mean is "practical" and if they used that word their readers would not be wondering what they meant.

Similarly, the use of "anticipate" to mean "expect" has just about left us without any word to express anticipation.

The once-dignified word "research" has fallen into common use to give false importance to routine chores. On the jacket of a book recently offered for popular sale I read that the author had been in Europe for "auctorial research." Advertising and promotion writers may be chiefly to blame for such misuse, but even men in science and technology abuse this word.

They are also whittling "parameter" down to a mere measurement.

At this point, readers doubtless are saying to themselves that this article was written from ignorance, and they are quite right.

A decade ago, I began to write about natural resources for the Milwaukee Journal—the first newspaper in the country with a full-time reporter in the whole broad field of resources. I attended meetings where scientists and technologists spoke, worked from their papers and summaries, and read extensively for background information. I had to give myself a short course in every new phase I tackled. For a while, I was depressed by my ignorance.

Then I realized that there was a very serious lack of communication between some scientific and technological people and the public. I realized that ignorance was an asset, because my task really was to interpret what these men said; to explain resource matters to people with as little grounding as I had, or less, and also more or less indifference.

Lack of communication is particularly serious in natural resource fields, where research and studies must solve problems or develop approaches to them. Men assigned to these tasks are too inclined to confine their discussions to the knowing circle. After they reach decisions or prepare plans, they spring their proposals on the public and expect them to be received gratefully and implemented. This seems to me a major reason why progress has been so slow toward wise management of resources.

It is important that the public be taken along on the whole trip. Usually some changes are required, support must be generated, money must be provided. People just do not accept changes unless they are convinced by good reasons. They or their representatives will not dig up money for things not understood. Except when they are frightened, I should say, and that provides a valid excuse for such a vulnerable document as "Silent Spring."

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I admire fine writing and polished discourse. I understand and appreciate the need for exactness in scientific and technical terms. Friends in various disciplines have pointed out that scientific papers must be written so that scientists everywhere can understand and use them. Many research authors do this and at the same time communicate very well with the public. But some carry their jargon outside and use it in speaking or writing for the public. Then communication breaks down.

An example is "discipline." I used the word here but I would not use it in a newspaper article. Stop 100 persons on the street and ask what "a discipline" is and I will be surprised if you get one right answer.

Even in their own meetings, scientists and technologists are sometimes less than comprehensible. At a luncheon one time, I sat with two technologists who talked two different dialects of the same jargon.

At a national seminar on aquatic biology that I attended, radioactivity was the subject of the first session. The "radiobiologists" talked a language that other biologists at times had difficulty in following.

TLM was one of the terms. A speaker, hearing the rustle of questions in the audience, explained that it was about the same as LD–50. Like others, I knew this meant that the dose lethal to half an experimental population, so I groped along with the speakers.

On the way out, I asked a Ph. D. of my acquaintance what TLM stood for. He said, "Oh, about the same as LD–50." I said, "I heard the man, but what do the letters represent?" He laughed and said he didn't know.

Another man turned around and said, "Toxicity limit median, I think." A third man corrected him, saying, "No, it's tolerance limit median."

Subsequently I received a notice of another seminar in California on "benthic biology." I looked in my "Webster Collegiate Dictionary" and found "benthos" (in the new word section) defined as fresh water bottom-dwelling organisms. Then I lugged my big "Merriam Webster" to the dining doom table and found that benthos was the flora and fauna of the sea bottom. Next I consulted encyclopedia at the office "Americana" said benthos was the fauna of ocean depths under 100 fathoms; "Britannica" said it was the sedentary bottom-living animal and plant life of the sea.

And I said, "Why don't people say what they mean."

I resent men who flaunt their erudition with frequent interpolations of exotic words where English would serve as well and with occasional whole paragraphs in text or footnote of untranslated Greek, Latin, French, and German.

Any man who has something of value to say, I think, does not have the right, ethically, to deny it to any mind capable of understanding the facts or the thoughts, simply because the possessor of that mind lacks his own high-level education.

Such men seem to forget that semantics, too, is a science and communication an art. And nothing has contributed as much to the advance of civilization as communication.

Where one author deliberately throws up linguistic barriers for his inferiors, some others fail to communicate because they are mentally marooned on chosen islands.

A few years go, a Midwestern university published a remarkable work on the vegetation of its State. Publication notice and book jacket said that the book was written with a minimum of technical terms, for the use of (among others) farmers, conservation workers and men in weed control and recreation.

The author really had me wearing out my dictionaries. I found 20 or 30 words in the first 2 or 3 chapters that were not in my "Collegiate," and some were not even in the "Merriam." I stuck with it and was well rewarded, but I wondered how many farmers, weed control men, and conservation workers went beyond such expressions as "varietal endemism," "morphological subspeciation," "altitudinal retardation of phenological events," or "Gaussian amplitude curve."

How many readers will use a dictionary, much less read with one at hand? And when the offering is oral, there is no dictionary and a man can lose his audience quickly.

A nationally known specialist on water resources recently addressed a Milwaukee gathering of conservationists. His paper was a polished masterpiece. My admiration was tarnished as I left the hall, when a lawyer commented, "I should have brought along a dictionary."

Perhaps it is a good omen that scientists and technicians who understand the necessity of communicating with the public have become critical of their associates who ignore their responsibility.

Marston Bates, University of Michigan zoologist, referred in one of his books to a new word, "biocenosis," coined as a substitute for "community."

"Biocenosis," he wrote, "leads easily to biomes and biochores, to ecosystems and ecotones. These are all lovely words but they don't really say anything new. The trouble is that the word-coiner, sinking blissfully into his additions, gradually loses all communication with the outside world. He emerges from time to time to complain that the world doesn't really understand or appreciate his important thoughts—meaning his big words."

Joseph Hickey, a University of Wisconsin professor, while he was editor of the Journal of the Wildlife Society, told me he ran across such gems as this:

"While piloting a Polar Cub 50 miles west of Churchill, two foxes were seen in a highly abnormal condition."

Aside from indicating that two foxes seem to have been piloting an airplane, this was not very informative.

And this one:

"A porcupine covered with Sarcoptes scabeii was brought to the laboratory in a morbid condition."

That journal once had a fuss in its letter column over editorial requests for polishing up manuscripts, which led Justin Leonard, assistant conservation director of Michigan, to comment:

"The Ph. D. in science can make journal editors quite happy with plain, unadorned, eighth-grade level composition."

Joseph P. Linduska, who edited the Interior Department's book, "Waterfowl Tomorrow," of multiple authorship, had quite a struggle getting some of the contributors to use plain language, suitable for popular reading. The Agriculture Department doubtless has had a similar problem with its yearbook.

As I explained to one of Linduska's authors, who sought my help, there is a simple rule: If an ordinary reader would have to look up a word, look it up for him and use the commonest synonym in the dictionary. Most readers won't bother; they will pass over the word or pass up the article.

They might not be helped by a dictionary in some instances. Example: "Soil amendment." Soil scientists like to use this one—probably to add a touch of dignity to earthy things. In a technical publication, it's probably all right. But the plain truth is that they are talking about fertilizer.

Scientists, particularly those in academic circles, are very wary of newspaper reporters. They are fearful of being made to "look bad," one explained to me. Look bad to whom? Surely not the newspaper readers in general? And just as surely not to fellow scientists, who will know that any fumbling was the reporter's, even if they do rib the victim.

If a scientist has a story that should interest a fair segment of the public, he should be glad to give it to a reporter. He has a right to ask the editor for a conscientious reporter if he does not get one the first time. He should take pains to see that the reporter understands the facts (a good reporter will see to that himself.) If something is wrong when the story appears in print, this should not call forth anguished outcries but rather lead to a friendly and helpful explanation of where the writer went wrong.

This attitude can be very rewarding both for the individual scientist and for fellow scientists who may find that reporter useful.

As a reporter, I was fortunate to get such help from scientists and technologists well equipped to communicate. I ran into others, typified by a man who was asked to check the irrigation section of a report I wrote on Colorado River salinity problems. My task was to make it simple enough to appeal to newspaper editors. The expert found it "difficult to review" because it was "oversimplified."

Watson Davis, director of Science Service, in an address some years ago at a scientific communication conference held by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said this:

"The great art in telling is to make the words mean what you want them to, not in your own mind but in the minds of others. There is little need for 'writing down.' This is demonstrated by the daily newspaper which serves children and old folks alike. Clearness and vividness are more needed than vocabulary limitations based on word lists."

Given the chance, I think that I could convince Mr. Watson that vocabulary limitation is necessary—not in the concept of "word lists" but in bilingual ability.

Scientific terms and the popular tongue surely are two different languages. The "great art" is, as Mr. Watson said, to make words meaningful in the minds of others. The simplest way, and really the only practical one, is to talk the other man's language. The alternative is to interpolate frequent explanations to make scientific or technological words meaningful. A little of this is good; too much will bore the listener or reader, if it does not affront him.

As for "writing down" (or talking down), it is dangerous even to think in such terms. Remind yourself that in the present state of biological evolution the people you address are apt to have minds as good as yours. They just lack the tools to use their minds as you use yours. Your job is to supply the tools.

Words are the tools of the mind. It has been written that man was unable to think much better than lower animals until he provided symbols and then words.

Ask yourself what your objective is. To impart knowledge? Or to parade knowledge?

If you want people to think about things that concern you and your work, use words they know or supply new, useful words. Do it casually, not in a way that seems to say, "See how much more I know than you do."

The author of the aforementioned book about a State's vegetation occasionally tried to do this. He used "podzolization" with the explanation that it meant topsoil impoverishment by leaching and translocation. But he needed simpler words even in his explanations.

I heard some years ago about a game biologist, talking to a group of farmers. He got off a string of big words and knew from the facial expressions that he was over his listeners' heads. So he said, "I won't attempt to explain that; you wouldn't understand it anyhow." Right there he lost them beyond recall.

Be sure, if you are talking or writing "down," people will get the message just as plainly as those farmers did, even if you don't do it as crudely as that.

As a writer or speaker, you should recognize that three areas of communication call for different efforts:

1. Your own group or discipline.

You may expect the language of a discipline to be familiar to is disciples, but not the jargon, or oral shorthand, of a specialized group within the discipline.

2. Others who may want your information and can be expected to put forth a reasonable effort to understand.

Some of the burden of communication may be placed on these people, but not all of it. You may make them reach a bit, expect them to ask questions and look up things. But a good writer or speaker will take on more than his share of the burden.

3. Those you want to interest, or should, but who lack the specialized vocabulary.

This group comprises most of the people to whom a man in the public service must address himself, from citizens to legislators. The burden of communicating is entirely on the writer or speaker. He must assume that only fairly common words will convey meaning and, in speaking, be alert for signs that the audience is not following him.

If you accept the duty of communicating and work at it successfully, more of your material will get into newspapers. Competition for news space is murderous. The editor's waste basket is large and his reporters' assignment sheet is crowded.

If your press releases do not get into print, if reporters do not come to your meetings or, having come, walk out and print nothing, examine your efforts.

Maybe your papers are too full of the kind of language I have described, or your summaries, which usually are more useful to the press, are equally foggy. I think that authors should not prepare summaries. That is a job for an interpreter.

In my observation, communication is much more effective if a press relations man is a good newspaperman who can pick up the scientific or technical knowledge he needs, rather than a scientist or technologist who may never be able to understand the newspaper business or what may seem to him its senseless whims.

At the aquatic biology seminar mentioned earlier, some papers contained material bound to interest large segments of the public, but it took some winnowing and translating. So the only local newspaper coverage was in the form of interviews with a couple of guest speakers from the conservation field, Ernest Swift and Seth Gordon. The interviews had very little relation to the seminar program but gave the newspapers a chance to get the seminar into their columns.

Later, at the National Conference on Water Pollution, there was a wealth of good material buried in the papers of top-ranking scientists and engineers. But it was what I said as leader of a panel on "Public Awareness and Citizen Responsibility" that provided the Associated Press with a lead for both its day and night stories.

In both cases, reporters used material they knew would be understandable and perhaps interesting to their readers.

Readers of this article, I am sure, have seen similar occurrences. They are food for thought rather than cause for chagrin.

People are not compelled to listen to you or read your papers. You are in a buyer's market, competing with murder, rape, politics, lukewarm war, aerospace travel and comics in the newspapers; entertainment on television; and sex, whodunits and westerns on drugstore book counters.

At the very least, you must make what you say understandable, and if you have the talent you had better make it interesting, too.

Regard it as a challenge, for that it surely is.

Eulogy to Chief Justice Tsukiyama of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my honorable colleagues will agree with me that the 50th State, despite many alleged handicaps, has made its transition from a territory to statehood with more ease and finesse than anticipated by many. That we were able to do this was due in large part to the outstanding leadership of Hawaii's citizenry. And so I stand here with heavy heart to inform you that one of the trailblazers of our great State has passed on to history.

He is Wilfred Chomatsu Tsukiyama, the first chief justice of the Hawaii State Supreme Court and a pioneer in many public endeavors. Justice Tsukiyama was many things to all of Hawaii's people. As jurist, legislator, attorney, and community leader, he devoted his life to principles which contributed to the best interest of Hawaii and its people.

Born in Honolulu of Japanese immigrants, he was one of the early leaders in the fight to prove that Americans of Japanese ancestry were loyal to their country, the United States, prior to and during the trying years of World War II. After the war, he won a seat in the territorial senate and rose to become the first person of oriental ancestry to be chosen president of that legislative body. As chief justice of the infant State of Hawaii, Tsukiyama won national recognition by being elected to the seven-member executive council of the Conference of Chief Justices.

With the passing of Justice Tsukiyama, Hawaii has suffered the loss of one of its ablest and most dedicated citizens. As Hawaii's Representative to Congress, as one who has long admired and highly respected the late chief justice, and as his personal friend and that of his surviving family, I wish to express my deepest sympathy to his widow and his children.

I also submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article written by Harriet Gee which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of January 6, 1966, summarizing Justice Tsukiyama's exemplary career:

JUSTICE TSUKIYAMA DIES AT AGE 68

(By Harriet Gee)

Wilfred Chomatsu Tsukiyama, 68, first chief justice of the Hawaii Supreme Court under statehood, died today in Kuakini Hospital.

Death was caused by cancer of the common duct and of the liver. He died at 6:20 a.m.

Tsukiyama entered the hospital December 8. He resigned as chief justice effective December 31 in a letter dated December 17.

He was born in Honolulu March 22, 1897.

Justice Tsukiyama, a Republican, distinguished himself during his colorful lifetime as an attorney, jurist, legislator, community leader, and athlete.

Although short in stature, he had a reputation for being long on oratory, a talent ripened by his many years in the territorial senate.

His mastery of the English language played no small part in his effectiveness as a speaker, no matter what the setting.

He was appointed chief justice in 1959 by former Gov. William F. Quinn, a 7-year term which was to expire in October 1966.

Justice Tsukiyama's own life and many achievements were an exemplification of the American way of life, something he believed in deeply.

His appointment as chief justice—the first American of Oriental ancestry to hold the position in any State in the Union—was a shining example of the American way.

Tsuky, as he was popularly known, led his first recorded crusade to prove that locally born Americans of Japanese ancestry are just as loyal as any other kind of Americans.

He was in the nucleus of a movement in the 1930's to have all Japanese with dual citizenships change their allegiance to one country only—either America or Japan.

But the battle was uphill all the way, and on two fronts.

On one side he had to fight the indifference of the Japanese people themselves.

The procedure in surrendering their Japanese citizenship was complicated and cumbersome, entailing involved correspondence and long waiting.

As a result, an appreciable number was still left in the undesirable status of dual citizens.

Tsukiyama said this caused tension and misunderstanding, "bringing upon the heads of us Americans of Japanese ancestry much undeserved and unwarranted suspicion on the part of some of our fellow citizens."

Then there was the second front—others in the community who questioned the loyalty of persons of Japanese ancestry.

Tsukiyama addressed this criticism to the "second front" in a public speech in 1938:

"Although loud accusations are being directed against the citizens of Japanese ancestry, it is significant that nary a whisper is raised against the dual citizens of other racial ancestries."

He found it necessary again in 1940 to say to the "second front," during a large public meeting in Hilo:

"The day is coming when the haole Americans will regret that they criticized us American citizens of Japanese ancestry.

"* * * That day will come when they realize that we are as loyal as they are to the United States of America.

"If these haole Americans wish to help us, they should build and not destroy; they should show us kindly guidance and tolerance, and not criticize our every action

"Even now, I challenge them to show me wherein we have been disloyal.

"Loyalty is a spontaneous love manifested by a man for the country of his choice, and his willingness to pay the ultimate sacrifice for his country when the moment comes.

"We American citizens of Japanese ancestry are ready to do anything for our country, the United States of America."

His talk resulted in immediate repercussions throughout the territory, prompting Tsukiyama to explain later that he meant only to say there is a group of persons who are prone to criticize citizens of Japanese ancestry unfairly.

Then came the Selective Service Act, which, Tsukiyama observed, has been a boon to the Americans of Japanese ancestry in demonstrating their loyalty.

He took the opportunity to remark in April 1941:

"There has been very little talk lately, even on the part of skeptics, regarding the loyalty of Hawaiian-born Japanese because of the large number of citizens of Japanese oncestry who have been called into the Army."

Justice Tsukiyama himself volunteered in 1942 for active military service but was not called because of his age. He was than 45.

In January of 1943, he again offered his services to his country by being the first Nisei in Hawaii to volunteer for combat units of Americans of Japanese ancestry being organized then by the Army.

This was 3 days before the drive was announced publicly.

"Although I'm 46 years old," Tsukiyama told newspaper reporters, "I'm going to pull as many strings as possible to become a member of the organization. I'll take anything they give me."

He was turned down again, though he claimed he was as physically perfect as a 20-year-old because of his active participation in sports.

He was then concentrating on golf and had an eight handicap.

Throughout World War II, however, he served as chief warden of zone 1 (Nuuanu to Damon tract) in the warden's division of the Office of Civilian Defense.

SURPRISE CANDIDATE

In 1946, Tsukiyama became a surprise candidate for the territorial senatorial race as a Republican, since it was known that he had previously declined requests from party members to make the race.

He said he yielded to calls from citizens of all walks of life, and filed his papers half an hour before the deadline.

By 1947, newsmen covering the legislature had agreed Oahu's freshman senator was one of the outstanding members of the upper house.

Tsukiyama was appointed chairman of the Judiciary Committee, one of the two top committee posts, and handled the job as if he had been doing it for years, newsmen noted.

Two years later, his alma mater—Coe College in Cedar Rapids, Iowa—honored him with a doctor of civil laws degree in recognition of his legislative career and public service.

He was then president of the territorial senate, the first American of Japanese ancestry to be so chosen. He was reelected, unopposed, as president of the senate in 1951.

Justice Tsukiyama was one of the most active, diligent and effective supporters of Hawaiian statehood.

In 1950, after he had testified before the U.S. Senate's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on the issue of race in Hawaii, Chairman Joseph C. O'Mahoney told him:

"Senator Tsukiyama, the committee has heard with a great deal of interest your persuasive statement, and is moved to know that a man of your ancestry has risen to a place of distinction under the American flag."

Then came 1954.

Tsukiyama was reelected to his third term in the territorial senate but by then the Republicans were in the minority, after a Democratic landslide at the polls.

MINORITY LEADER

He was elected senate minority leader and continued to hold the respect of colleagues, regardless of party affiliation.

He controlled business with dignity and restraint, but was known to unleash strong criticism on those who tampered with senatorial processes.

In 1957, he led the fight against a bill calling for the end of capital punishment, but lost by a 10-to-5 vote.

One newspaper reported:

The protest "stormed into a thundering filibuster by Tsukiyama.

"The filibuster, believed to be only the third in Hawaii senate history, created perhaps the greatest excitement on the floor this session and had Democratic senators stymied for a while.

"Giving his personal views against abolishment of capital punishment, Tsukiyama blazed on for an hour before the senators seemed to realise he was filibustering against the bill.

"When it appeared he might roar past the midnight deadline of the session in an attempt to prevent stopping the clock—thereby ending the session—they (Democratic senators) pulled the clock plug shortly after 9 p.m."

The Democrats had managed to stumble on a senate rule on a point of order, and thereby halt Tsukiyama.

Tsukiyama won his fourth 4-year term as senator in 1958 and again became minority floor leader. He was the only Republican among the five senators from his fifth district.

U.S. SENATE RACE

Then came statehood, and Tsukiyama stepped into the U.S. Senate race.

But he had trouble engaging his foe, the late Oren E. Long.

Reporter Don Horio, of the Star-Bulletin, now Governor John A. Burns' press secretary, recorded this happening thusly:

"Long has remained steadfastly aloof, refusing to be lured into even the mildest scrapes with Tsukiyama, who recently expressed his frustration before an 11th district GOP meeting:

"'I'm up against an invisible candidate. I can't debate with him because he's mute and doesn't say anything. It's extremely difficult talking to the wall.'"

Horio wrote that Long "ducked this jab deftly" by replying with a typical "no comment."

Tsukiyama was defeated in his bid for national office, but another great honor was bestowed upon him, that of being the first chief justice of the new State's supreme court.

Those who know Tsukiyama say the job of chief justice caused him to tone down his stentorian style of speaking, and his remarks, to fit the dignity of the court.

Recognition continued to come his way.

In 1960, he was elected to the seven-member executive council of the Conference of Chief Justices, an organization of the country's 50 State supreme court justices.

"I consider it an honor that they reached out to Hawaii, which is only a neophyte as a State," Justice Tsukiyama said of his selection.

In 1963, Premier Hayato Ikeda, of Japan, picked Justice Tsukiyama to receive the highest award ever given an American of Japanese ancestry, with the approval of Emperor Hirohito.

Justice Tsukiyama, accompanied by his wife, went to Japan to personally receive the second class of the Order of the Sacred Treasure from Premier Ikeda.

It was given him in recognition of the American way of life and his contributions toward promotion of better American-Japanese relations.

Justice and Mrs. Tsukiyama also enjoyed a personal interview with Emperor Hirohito during which no interpreter was present.

Tsukiyama's ability to converse in formal Japanese was a high tribute to his early language school training in Hawaii.

Being chief justice was like most any other job, in that it had its trying—and pleasant—moments.

He had made numerous recommendations to the State legislature that they give Oahu more circuit judges to handle the heavy backlog of civil cases, but got nowhere.

He reminded them—Democrats and Republicans—their parties promised in 1962 to provide more judges.

"The demands of judicial administration cannot be put off indefinitely," he said.

Finally, five more circuit judgeships were created by the legislature during the 1965 session in February.

SWORE IN HIS SON

It was a memorable day in May 1963, when Chief Justice Tsukiyama swore in eight new attorneys. One of them was his son, Donald.

Each attorney approached the bench to receive his commission, handshake, and whispered congratulations from the chief justice.

When Donald was handed his commission, the chief justice said in an audible voice, "Congratulations, son." This touched off a moment of laughter in an otherwise formal session.

Then the chief justice had some fatherly advice.

"The building of a clientele is of necessity a slow process. There will be moments of disappointment, discouragement and despondency.

"But through perseverance and stick-to-itiveness you will have an abundance of success.

"No happiness, no joy, no jubilance can be more rapturously profound than that which comes to bar students who pass their examination."

Justice Tsukiyama was graduated from Kaahumanu School in 1914, Japanese High School in 1915, and McKinley High School in 1918.

At McKinley he played football, breaking a longstanding attitude among Japanese that football was a dangerous game.

He also played 3 years of high school baseball as a combination pitcher-shortstop and took part in track as a sprinter.

In spite of an accelerated scholastic program—he finished high school in 3 years—he was one of four honor graduates from McKinley.

He then went into the Army at Schofield Barracks and the scrappy little man went out for football and made the 1st Hawaiian Infantry squad.

In 1921, he went to Coe College for prelaw study, playing freshman football and varsity baseball.

STUDIED IN CHICAGO

At the University of Chicago Law School, he squeezed in 1 year of varsity baseball.

He returned with his law degree and became associated with the law firm of Huber, Kemp, and Stainback before joining the city and county attorneys office as a deputy in 1929.

He was promoted to chief of the city attorney's office in 1933 and served until 1940. One of his deputies was Hiram L. Fong, now a U.S. Senator from Hawaii.

After leaving the city attorney's office, Justice Tsukiyama went into the private practice of law as a partner in the firm of Tsukiyama and Yamaguchi.

Justice Tsukiyama was a member and officer of many business firms, and served in just about every worthwhile community organization.

One of his greatest satisfactions came from helping Okinawans and Japanese coming to Hawaii.

In recognition of his numerous accomplishments and devoted service to the community, he was chosen overall Father of the Year for 1965 by the Retail Board of the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce.

Surviving are his wife, Marian; three sons, Owen, Donald, and Roy; and three daughters, Mrs. June Amil, Mrs. Doris Hatanaka, and Caren.

Tribute to Memory of Adlai E. Stevenson by Robert Moses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include the address of Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp. at the Adlai E. Stevenson Memorial ceremonies on the occasion of Illinois Constitution Day in Lincoln Theater of the Illinois Pavilion on August 26, 1965:

Governor Kerner, Ambassador Goldberg, Mr. Newman, and friends, only a short time ago in this very Illinois Pavilion, where the animated image of the Great Emancipator has held so many visitors spellbound, Adlai Stevenson addressed Illinois, the fair and the world beyond on behalf of brotherhood and world peace.

That occasion brought back vividly to me the events which led to the establishment of the United Nations headquarters in New York, the prolonged arguments over location here and abroad, the debates about a great 40-square mile compound off in the wilderness or suburbs, on the order of Laputa, Ultima Thule, Utopia, Canberra, New Delhi, and Brasilia, isolated, self-contained and immune from infection, as against a 20-acre midtown park, surrounded on three sides by towers and canyons.

The early croakers and prophets of doom as usual were wrong. New York City was not swallowed by the United Nations, and the United Nations was not engulfed by New York. Great polyglot cities have learned to absorb newcomers, no matter how strange, impressive, and awe-inspiring. We like being the world capital. We have faith in the United Nations. We know no substitute. If we have any misgivings about the ultimate outcome of this parliament of man, it is about prolonged, futile oratory, which is another way of saying that, if generally we had an economy of words, all the other economies would take care of themselves. The average observer cares little whether the rules and etiquette follow Hoyle, Hansard, parliamentary law, the Marquis of Queensberry or Amy Vanderbilt, so long as something tangible results.

The United Nations has been singularly fortunate in its executives. I remember Trygve Lie, the rise of the United Nations from shambles to glory, the headquarters committee, and the famous architects from the four corners of the glode. As chairman of the coordinating building committee, I had a ringside seat at contests unequaled since the gladiators fought in the coliseum. How could Noah and the architect of the Tower of Babel get along without a headquarters committee and simultaneous translation? Lie had the bluff, hearty forthrightness and tenacity of the Vikings of the North. He needed these qualities and characteristics at that time. Dag Hammerskjöld, who succeeded him, was a statesman by inheritance instinct, and training, and served admirably in his time, ending as a martyr to a great cause. U Thant, independent, detached, unperturbed and dispassionate, now seeks to find the common bond which will reconcile the apparently irreconcilables.

Adlai Stevenson became our own chief representative when his moral courage, innate courtesy, sharp wit, subtle irony in debate, broad experience in government and politics, his splendid record, his American, midwestern idealism, his essential simplicity and his gift of words, unequalled in our public life since that other great Princetonian, Woodrow Wilson, were indispensable. He may at times have been discouraged, but he never ceased to labor for at least a durable truce based on our common humanity. I suppose that no other American in his time could have presented to the world so frank and winning a picture of America as an awakening giant in world affairs, a world power without as yet a world outlook. No one could have explained better our characteristic impatience with deviousness, with protocol, with language to disguise thought and our bewilderment as we found that many recipients of our largesse were not only unappreciative, but positively resentful of our generous responses to their demands.

Obviously, heading the U.S. delegation to the United Nations is no sinecure. It is no place for a sensitive plant. Having been a Governor, candidate for the highest office, diplomat, judge or Cabinet member guarantees no immunity. He must help to persuade an impatient citizenry, still in the pioneer stage, against every instinct and contrary to its normal temperament, to fight battles which are not wars, to act under no traditional, accepted rules, to am at a stalemate instead of surrender of the enemy and complete victory. He must represent executive policies with complete, unswerving loyalty, implement them with every talent he possesses and absorb immense punishment in the process. To the superlatively decent statesman the contrast between word and deed becomes appalling. We cunningly develop in our soldiers the instinct for the jugular and then command them to behave like gentlemen on an errand of mercy.

When, in November 1956, the news of the Egyptian invasion reached the U.N., I happened to be in a box at the Metropolitan with Sir Pierson Dixon. They kept sending for him to come to headquarters to face the music there. At the first intermission Henry Cabot Lodge came over to get him, but Dixon refused. Finally, in the second act a peremptory call came and Dixon had to go. As he left to face the critics, I heard Lady Dixon whisper, "Just another crisis, I suppose." Dixon did not invent the invasion of Egypt. He simply had to stand the gaff.

Our Ambassador must cultivate the friendship of nations who don't want to be in the U.N. but can't afford to stay out. He must sit through charges that Uncle Sam is an imperialist and shylock. He must welcome to our ranks new republics from India with half a billion, African states of small numbers and Singapore with a handful. He must in his own person refute the weary, homegrown sophisticates who tell the eager critics abroad that American democracy is hopelessly torn, miserable, decadent and bound for the ash heap. He must study time and practice timing. He must anticipate and accept with equanimity the fact that many of yesterday's friends are today's acquaintances and tomorrow's critics.

It has been said that all institutions are the lengthened shadows of great men. Certainly here at the fair the enormous popularity of Michelangelo's Pieta, the Illinois Lincoln and the Churchill Pavilion prove the truth of this adage: It is idle to pretend that ours or any other is a government of laws and not of men. Most people comprehend leaders rather than laws, and men rather than institutions. No cause gains acceptance until it is personified.

Many class Stevenson as a liberal. I don't know today what that is, unless it is a leader with an open mind, unafraid of change, with faith in the improvability of mankind, happiest on the side of the angels and willing to battle for them. What Stevenson said of Nehru might well have been said of Stevenson himself, that "He has a common touch that excites the devotion and understanding of all kinds and conditions of people, and he has a pen and tongue that stir the hearts of millions," and that "The hope of the world rests with leaders who have the gift of firmness and of flexibility."

The eloquence of Adlai Stevenson will no longer enliven and electrify the chambers of the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations, but his voice, recorded and remembered, will be heard long after he has gone to where beyond these voices there is peace. And if he comes back, it is in the guise of the "Prairie Lawyer, Master of Them All," painted by Vachel Lindsay:

> "He cannot sleep upon his hillside now.
>   He is among us—as in times before.
> And we who toss and lie awake for long
>   Breathe deep, and start, to see him pass
>   the door."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Spacemen To Drop Home Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the feature article by Hugh Aynesworth in the Dallas Morning News of December 18, 1965, catches the excitement of the successful rendezvous of Gemini 6 and 7 and its importance as a stepping stone to a manned landing on the moon by 1970. It is an inspiring portrayal of our astronauts rendezvous in Gemini 6 and 7 and it provides a magnificent example of our space work by the personnel of NASA and the Department of Defense in supporting this difficult operation. This is a clear demonstration that our national space program personnel are developing the capability of assuring a landing on the moon by 1970 and will be successful if provided the support to complete the next crucial steps in the Gemini program of docking two vehicles in space and pushing on to the Apollo manned flight. The editorial follows:

SPACEMEN TO DROP HOME TODAY

(By Hugh Aynesworth)

HOUSTON, TEX.—Gemini 7 space pilots, Frank Gorman and Jim Lovell, bearded and dirty, but in apparently good condition, will steer their cluttered spacecraft back to earth Saturday morning—winding up the most prodigious space mission in history.

They are scheduled to drop into the Atlantic Ocean, about 690 miles east of Cape Kennedy, Fla., about 8:05 a.m., Dallas time.

Meanwhile, in Houston, some truly amazing pictures, both color and black and white, were released by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They were the ones taken by Wally Schirra and Tom Stafford during their highly successful Gemini 6 redezvous flight.

Told that all three television networks were showing the pictures "live," Borman remarked:

"Great. And here we are in our underwear."

The Gemini 7 crew could not be seen in the pictures. Several more reels and magazines were being developed late Friday night in hopes that Gemini 6 might have captured some closeups of Borman or Lovell, as they pressed close against their windows.

Schirra was fearful that the pictures would be poor because of the smudging on his windshield, but they were as good as or better than the ones taken during Ed White's historic space walk a few months ago.

When Astronaut Elliot See told Gemini 7 how good the photographs were, "They're just tremendous," he said, Borman replied: "It was a tremendous experience, really.

"I hope we have some good shots of them, too."

The pictures clearly showed the trailing wires mentioned by Gemini 6's crew Wednesday, as they pulled close for the first rendezvous. In one of the movie reels, you can see the Gemini 7 rolling over and over, trying to dump the water out of their water boiler. Brilliant orange flames streaked out into nothingness when the "7" fired its thruster.

See estimated they were 20 to 30 feet apart.

Flight officials were pleased Friday night as they updated Gemini 7's flight plans, fed the computers reentry and splashdown data and retired for a good night's rest before Saturday's sometime hectic operation.

Flight Director Chris Kraft, Flight Surgeon Dr. Charles Berry and several others had kept a long vigil Thursday night when it looked as though Gemini 7 might have to be brought down a day short of its 14-day goal. Borman had expressed excited concern that the return of the second Delta "p" on his pilot panel might foretell the decline of the No. 1 fuel cell section.

"I'd hate to pass that carrier if we weren't sure," he radioed at least three times.

Kraft assured him they would be certain or bring them home early.

The No. 2 Delta "p" light came on the first day of the flight, but that fuel section offered no trouble for several days.

The No. 1 light blinked on—then off—then on again Friday, but still the fuel cells showed no degradation and Kraft said Friday night they had worked "admirably."

The "7" crew spent much of the day shooting the remainder of their film, stowing most of their equipment and winding up what experiments they could with minimum usage of fuel. They reported 5 percent of their fuel remaining.

Borman was particularly interested in exactly how close Schirra had come to the recovery ship, the carrier U.S.S. *Wasp*. He was told NASA considered it officially 2 nautical miles past the ship and 12 to the right. "I've got to get the accurate figures because I've got a lot riding on that," Borman returned. Borman and Schirra had made a bet, about which spacecraft would land closest to the "footprint"—the planned splashdown spot.

Schirra's instruments were minutely incorrect, causing him to steer the Gemini off course to the right, Kraft said.

Kraft told Borman he might have a hard time collecting from Schirra even if he did come closer.

"But if Wally wins, he'll claim it was a fair bet," laughed See. Meanwhile, Schirra and Stafford flew back to Cape Kennedy, Fla., to begin intensive debriefings. Schirra had lost 3 pounds during the flight, Stafford 10½ pounds. As usual, they quickly regained the weight, said Dr. Berry. Schirra weighed more Friday than he did Wednesday morning at lift-off, Stafford had regained 8 pounds by Friday afternoon.

Told by See that Schirra and Stafford looked fresh, "Like they've just been up for a local flight in a T-38," Borman replied:

"That's all they have been, for crying out loud."

Weather in the recovery area is expected to be near perfect for Gemini 7's return, See advised the crew.

Lovell, expecting to become a father again, momentarily (his fourth), asked if his wife, Marilyn, had come through yet.

Dr. Berry answered him: "She said to tell you that we had a little bit of a scare the other night, but it didn't amount to anything, and she's sorry she couldn't deliver."

"Well, that's the way it goes," Lovell replied.

Abraham Lincoln as Seen From the Eyes of Ambassador Mehdi Vakil of Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the treasured friendships the molding of which enriched my service as a delegate to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations was that with Ambassador Dr. Mehdi Vakil, the permanent representative of Iran to the United Nations. He is a statesman and a diplomat of the highest order and one of the influential leaders in the deliberations of the United Nations.

I am extending my remarks to include the television address on Abraham Lincoln delivered by Ambassador Mehdi Vakil on October 15, 1964, by request of his personal friend and coworker, Adlai E. Stevenson:

What theme would Abraham Lincoln have chosen to develop were he, rather than an Iranian, occupying this place today and under an obligation to say something more than perfunctory to you. Note that I do not ask what words he would have utered; they would have soared and I have no power to fly my kite so high.

Reflecting on the context in which he found himself obliged to speak, he would very likely have wondered whether there was anything in his own experience that would be valuable to relate to the purposes served here. At first glance the prospect is not promising. This is an international setting and Lincoln was not an international man. The horizons of his time were much more foreshortened than our own and the problems of his administration required him to turn his gaze inward rather than beyond the country's limits.

You already know, of course, that I shall not put you off with such an answer. The reason is not merely that I could hardly take up the time allotted me with mere naysaying and expect to hold your attention.

It is that the meaning of this man and of his experience belongs not to the United States alone, much less to Illinois. He is, as was said of another moral hero who was martyred in a political struggle, a man for the ages and his name is a byword among all peoples and in all places for moral achievement. His story remains fresh wherever men still aspire to a fairer world.

The winds of equality are blowing irresistibly throughout the world today. It was Lincoln who unchained them. It was not a decision to which he came willingly or quickly. The conviction which finally resulted in the Emancipation Proclamation took most of his grown lifetime to mature. He was not one to be glib about the relevance of moral precepts to political life, for he knew that statecraft is not an exercise in the application of ethical aphorisms offering easy choices between indentifiable alternatives of black and white. Reread the Cooper

Union speech if you want a masterly analysis of how difficult it is to practice the art of reconciling moral and political choices.

Lincoln knew before he died that he had guided the ship of state safely past the rocks of disunity. What he would be most likely to want to learn is the outcome of the agonized decision he had made in 1863. I think he would not be much surprised to learn that the course since then had not been smooth and that the politics of equality were still giving the world trouble.

The idea that his country had become the world's leader would please him, but he would be likely to search deeper into the meaning of this leadership. Master politician though he was, he would, I suspect, ask wither this leadership was tending, what its purposes were and what principles informed it. I imagine he would have been impatient with talk about power and national interest which neglected to say something other than commonplace about the purpose to which the national power is put and the principles which informed the relations between one nation's interest and its neighbor's. He would guess that there were problems and that they showed some continuity with the problems of his own time.

Once he understood that only in the century since his death had the historical scene been fully revealed and that the newcomers on the stage vastly outnumbered those who had held it earlier, he would be bound to ask what part they were cast in. He would not, I think, be much surprised to learn that they were acting the role of aspirants to equality in a drama entitled "The Politics of Inequality."

Trailing heaven's draperies as he would, he might now be readier to declare it a law of politics that what is morally unacceptable in the relations of man and man tends in time to become politically unacceptable also, and tends therefore to be an impediment to unity of political purpose and action.

Though he might at first find the scale of the world's absorption in getting and spending breathtaking, he would, I am sure, have less difficulty than some of our contemporaries in understanding why the problem of livelihood had become so important. A hundred years' absence would give him an advantage in perceiving the importance of adaptaing to the changes between the bread and butter principles of his time and the more complicated economic imperatives of our own.

The name and notion of international organization would be strange to him, but his sympathy would leap to the news that there was a house of nations or general assembly. The name United Nations might move him to ask whether this denoted promise of fulfillment.

Would he be dismayed to learn that although the government of this house purported to rest on the rock of the equality of men and nations, practice belied the noble promise of the charter; and that when room had to be made for newly fledged nations this was done at the expense of the poor and weak? An amendment to enlarge the membership of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council is now making the rounds of the world's capitals. Twenty-three nations have ratified it, not one of them a major power, although it might have been supposed that, if unwilling to sacrifice any of their own advantages, they would at least be willing to provide additional places which would cost them nothing.

The history of the trade relations of the rich and poor nations offers no better vistas. The so-called developing countries remained enslaved to the economic power and decisions of the developed countries, dependent on export revenues from primary products subject to catastrophic fluctuations of price. Experience does not support the belief that a serious purpose to enable these countries to develop independent economic strength underlies the policies of those who have already arrived. Whatever is won comes only after protracted and bitter struggle. Deference to equality may not be easy, but unity cannot be won and maintained for less.

Long before Lincoln, a great Persian poet, Saadi, wrote of man's inhumanity to man as follows: "You who can keep aloof from the misfortunes of your other you, have no claim to the title of man."

You will pardon me, I hope, if in this connection I point to the six-point program of economic and social emancipation developed by His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran. The program rests on the Shah's conviction that the human imperative so movingly phrased by the poet, must be accepted as the principle governing the relations of men in society.

What Lincoln would make of East-West tensions I don't know, but the reference to difficulties between North and South would seem familiar. He would grasp readily how political inequality, when compounded by economic inequality, induced frustration and despair, and that political dangers were bound to follow.

In short, he would not be long in perceiving the perils to peace and human existence in disunity, and the cardinal importance of equality as the key to unity.

One more observation before I close. In the Cooper Union Address, Lincoln declared that no slave insurrection was being fomented or was likely. It is almost the only passage in his speech without relevance to our own day.

A Logical Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Granville Sentinel, Granville, N.Y., on December 30.

In my opinion, the editorial raises some proper questions with respect to draft deferments. It is my hope that the Selective Service System will take whatever steps might be necessary to review the 1½ million class II deferments before we start inducting married men with families. One of the prime targets of the anti-Vietnam civil disobedience campaign is the Selective Service System or the draft. The get-out-of-Vietnam movement from the very beginning has placed strong emphasis on efforts to incite young men to either refuse to serve in the Armed Forces or to evade the draft. I personally think it is time we reconsider the individual merits of the 1½ million students deferred in order to determine whether or not class II deferments are in fact contributory to the best interests of this country.

I am pleased to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

A Logical Question

Draft deferments in class II are for the purpose of disrupting as little as possible civilian activities which are contributory to the national health, safety, or interest. There are no blanket deferments; each case must be considered on its individual merits.

The question has been raised as to whether the Selective Service System has the right to classify out of class II–S students who interfer with the functioning of the System. The question really should be, can any local board, under the provisions of selective service regulations, keep any registrant in any class II deferment who in any way takes actions which are not in the best interests of the national health, safety, or interest.

The Selective Service System certainly must defer those registrants in industry who are engaged in essential activities and are employed in critical occupations within those industries. It must also defer those who are employed in the production for market of a substantial quantity of those agricultural commodities that are necessary to the national health, safety, or interest. It must also defer students when it is found that their activity in study is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. Should registrants deferred in industry or agriculture who take action which is detrimental to the interests of the Nation continue to be deferred?

When a registrant within the age group being inducted is deferred some registrant has to take his place in Selective Service System processing toward induction. Now that the System is about to induct married men should not those single men who are deferred in class II have their deferments reviewed to determine whether their current performance within the essential activity justifies a continuation of their deferment in the national interest? There are over a million and a half students deferred. Are all these deferments in the best interest of the Nation?

Congressman Horton's Tribute to WBBF's Editorial Position of Concern Over Federal Threats to Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents were the beneficiaries earlier this month of a broadcast commentary on the administration's role in confronting the Nation's steel industry. It is an expression of editorial opinion which very precisely parallels my view of the situation, and does so sharply and succinctly.

So that my colleagues in Congress and the readers of the Congressional Record throughout the country may similarly benefit from this thoughtful analysis, I take pleasure in sharing it herewith:

The Government and the Steel Industry

The Government and the steel industry have come to what appears to be an agreement: the steel industry has agreed not to raise its rates as much as individual companies had intended, and the Government has given its nod of approval to the slight price increase on which the industry seems to have settled.

We suppose that many people consider that news worthy of a long sigh of relief: the Government has maintained the price stability it feels it needs in the battle against inflation, and the steel industry has to raise its prices. Everybody should be happy.

Please don't count WBBF among the happy spectators. We confess that we're pleased that the Government has successfully guarded against an inflationary move, and we're delighted that the steelmen have made at least a token move in the direction of free commerce.

But we are deeply troubled by the price we are paying for a stable economy. The price is freedom. Clearly, some large industries in our Nation no longer have the freedom to decide what their prices should be. The factors of supply and demand—long considered to be the factors determining prices in a free economy—must now make room for an additional element: Government control.

That's why WBBF does not join the cheering for the peace in the steel war. The arm of government has reached pretty far already. We're worried about how much further it will reach.

Editor Seltzer—In Love With Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following story from the January 7 issue of the Cleveland Press contains the remarkable story of a remarkable man.

I know my colleagues will enjoy sharing this inspiring article:

EDITOR SELTZER: A MAN IN LOVE WITH HIS HOMETOWN

In 37 exciting and fruitful years as editor of the Press, Louis Benson Seltzer has served the city of Cleveland. His role has been varied: reformer, watchdog, press agent, spark plug of Ohio's largest daily newspaper, friend of all the people.

He has, in his own words, "walked with the people in their hour of problems and their hour of happiness," and perforce has shared their dreams, their frustrations, and their not infrequent disappointments.

In so doing, Seltzer shaped an extraordinary career in the image of a Horatio Alger character and left an imprint on his city perhaps unmatched by any editor in the land.

"It would be possible," historian Bruce Catton wrote in 1956, "to argue that he (Seltzer) is today the best and most effective editor in America.

However that might be—and there are those who maintain Catton understated his premise—it is true that Seltzer's stature as an editor is such that he repeatedly turned down offers to edit papers in larger cities, including New York and Chicago.

His stature as a citizen is suggested by the fact he was offered appointment to the U.S. Senate in 1952 to fill out the term of the late Robert A. Taft. He declined that, too.

Seltzer rejected these offers, and many more, because he was in love with Cleveland and never considered leaving it. Twenty years ago he wrote:

"This is my town. I love it. Some men adopt a place and stay. This is where I was born; this is where I stay. To me, Cleveland is the greatest place on earth. There is no other like it."

On another occasion, Seltzer justified his decision to stay in his hometown with the words, "I like people more than I like money."

The monetary rewards of being editor of the Press were not inconsiderable, of course, but it was the contact with people—people he grew up with and solicitously cultivated—that kept Seltzer in Cleveland. He could not possibly have established the same contacts anywhere else.

Ninth in the line of Press editors, Seltzer harnessed a unique mixture of sentimentality and toughness to the helm of a newspaper which long before had built a reputation for crusading in the people's interest.

Seltzer's Alger-esque rise to editor began, really, with his birth in a three-room house on Seymour Avenue at Fulton Road on September 1897.

His childhood was spent in poverty—so extreme sometimes that small loans tided the family over while father Charles Alden Seltzer, a carpenter by trade, hunched over a writing table turning out western tales that weren't to sell until much later.

Knowing his family's desperate need, and possessed of uncommon ambition to rise above the neighborhood, Seltzer obtained his father's reluctant permission to quit school at 13 and take an office boy job with the old Cleveland Leader.

One day, on a message pickup, Louis saw something that looked like a news story. He wrote it up and it landed on page 1. Seltzer's writing career was launched.

He became a reporter at $15 a week for the Leader at 15, but was soon fired by a city editor who advised him to "get out of the newspaper business; you're not cut out for it."

Eventually, after service with an ad agency and after a short hitch in the Army, young Seltzer approached the late Victor Morgan, then editor of The Press, and asked for a job.

"I want more than anything in the world to be on the Press," he pleaded. Morgan gave him the job on October 31, 1916.

Shortly thereafter, Seltzer had his only encounter with the late E. W. Scripps, founder of the Press and the Scripps-Howard newspaper group. Dashing out of the building to cover a story, the young reporter ran into the massive publisher, just coming in for a visit.

"Let me go, sir. Let me go, sir," Seltzer exclaimed. "I'm covering a story."

Apparently his eagerness to get at the job impressed Scripps. In any event, when Seltzer was just 19 he was made city editor. Three months later, he startled Editor Morgan by asking to be restored to reporting. "I need more experience," he said.

Seltzer became a general assignment reporter, city hall reporter and then city editor again. At one stage, during the rise of the Van Sweringen brothers, Seltzer became a sort of vice president in charge of the vans for the Press.

In 1924 Seltzer became politics editor—one who didn't hesitate to get Gov. Harry Davis, former mayor of Cleveland, out of bed at 6:30 and give him a rough questioning.

Soon Seltzer was chief editorial writer and in line, everyone thought, for the next editor of the Press.

Seltzer's first big disappointment came, in 1926, when Ted O. Thackrey, the paper's boyish managing editor, was named editor. Another newspaper offered Seltzer the job of editor at 50 percent increase in salary but he decided to stick with the Press.

The decision was wise, for 2 years later, on July 9, 1928, Seltzer was named editor.

A year later, Editor Seltzer and his chief editorial writer, Carlton Matson, were charged with contempt of court and fined for a Press editorial criticizing a judge. Their fines were set aside by a higher court but Seltzer was well on the way to recognition as a controversial public figure.

Under Seltzer's leadership, the Press quickly won an international reputation for courageous crusading and fearless reporting. It also added a major new dimension—public service.

Its achievements in that journalistic area were described by Richard L. Williams in a Life article on Seltzer, entitled "Mr. Cleveland," in 1950. He wrote:

"The Press is the world's most solicitous paper. It registers Clevelanders in a cradle roll at birth, sends their mothers bulletins on their care and feeding, polices their government for them during their taxpaying years, throws parties for them in their old age and prints a knowledgeable obituary when they die.

"From there on, it reluctantly leaves them on their own."

As editor, Seltzer was the spark plug behind almost every major step the Press made either to endear itself to its readers or to impress upon them the fact of its indispensability to them.

Under Seltzer, the Press has sparked drives that raised many thousands of dollars for worthy causes. In 1956, at the time of the Hungarian revolt, it dispatched a relief plane to the aid of refugees pouring over the Austrian border.

Even now, it has underway Hong Kong Reunion, a Press-sponsored and financed visit of three Cleveland families with their servicemen from Vietnam.

These feats, and others, won many professional honors for the Press over the years. A little over a year ago it received Time magazine's accolade as 1 of the 10 best newspapers in America.

Over the years, Seltzer has written hundreds of personal editorial page essays signed only "LBS." Mostly these were warm tributes to people who otherwise might never be singled out for newspaper mention.

Not all of Seltzer's campaigns have been successful. One of the first pieces he wrote after becoming editor was addressed to city hall and asked:

"How long are we going to continue to erect neck-twisting traffic signals at street intersections? If so, why?"

Thirty-seven years later, the traffic lights are still twisting people's necks.

Under Seltzer's editorship, The Press has been primarily a local newspaper featuring local news. He feels strongly about the priority of such news, expressing himself thusly in an article in 1956 in the Saturday Review:

"Local situations are the conversation pieces for nine-tenths of the talk among newspaper readers. Most papers, however, give nine-tenths of page 1 to news from remote and less controversial areas.

"Nobody's going to do the local digging-reporting if the newspapers don't. Some of the good magazines may do the job in national or international situations but they probably won't come into the smaller towns for obvious reasons. Nor will radio and TV do it. Their field has settled down to be mostly entertainment."

A dapper man who once possessed 61 suits at one time, each flaunting an overblown silk handkerchief from the breast pocket, Seltzer long ago became a conspicuous figure at functions where an adroit toastmaster was needed.

His participation in community affairs, of course, has gone far beyond that. He has headed numerous local organizations—the welfare federation, Cleveland Convention and Visitors Bureau, Greater Cleveland Safety Council, among others—and, on the national scene he is a member of the Pulitzer Prize Advisory Board and a founder of the American Press Institute.

One of his most prized possessions is the Brotherhood Award given him in 1951 by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in appreciation of his long labor in that vineyard.

Because of his commitments as editor, involving speeches and personal appearances by the dozens every week, Seltzer's family life has necessarily been of a special sort.

Away from home much of the time at night, he nevertheless tried to have an early dinner with Mrs. Seltzer at home before setting out on his evening itinerary. Often Mrs. Seltzer accompanied him—even in the last months of her life—and his solicitude for her was often commented upon by persons in the audience.

Seltzer met his bride-to-be by the simple and direct process of writing her a note while she played piano in a movie theater. This began a courtship that ended in their marriage at 17. Their marriage of almost 51 years—blessed with two children—came to an end a month ago when Mrs. Seltzer died of cancer.

Their two children are Mrs. Shirley (Arthur E.) Cooper of Cleveland and Chester, a newspaperman in Bakersfield, Calif. Seltzer's lone surviving brother, Robert, is a columnist for The Press.

There are also five grandchildren, Chester's two sons in California, and the Coopers' three children, Ted, at Indiana University, Laura at Rocky River High, and Mrs. John (Leigh Cooper) Eastman whose 1-year-old daughter was named Marion Elizabeth Eastman II to honor her grandmother.

Birthday Salutation to Republic of Chad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am happy and honored to extend birthday greetings to the Republic of Chad, to Francois Tombalbaye, the able President of the Republic, to Boukar Abdoul, Chad's distinguished and popular Ambassador to the United States, and to all the people of this proud and happy land. Although independence came to Chad on August 11, 1960, it is January 11 that is celebrated as its national holiday.

Chad is the largest country, both in area and population, of former French Equatorial Africa. With an area of over 500,000 square miles, it is more than twice the size of France, or approximately as big as California, Texas, and Oklahoma. Chad is bordered by Libya on the north, Sudan on the east, Central African Republic on the south, and Niger, Nigeria, and Cameroon on the west. The capital, Fort Lamy, is near the Cameroon border just south of Lake Chad.

France organized Chad as a military area on September 5, 1900. In 1910 it became one of the four territories of French Equatorial Africa, which was dissolved in 1959 when Chad, as well as the three others—the Middle Congo, now Republic of the Congo, Ubangui-Shari, now Central African Republic, and Gabon—became fully autonomous members of the French community.

The independence of Chad, as well as that of the other former French territories in West and Equatorial Africa, climaxed a series of measures on the part of France tending toward increased autonomy for its overseas territories. These measures were inaugurated by the French Constitution of 1946 which conferred French citizenship on inhabitants of black African dependencies and other overseas areas, decentralized certain powers, and initiated participation by local advisory assemblies in the political life of the overseas territories.

The enactment of the Overseas Reform Act, known as the Loi Cadre of June 23, 1956, introduced further liberalizing reforms. These forms, in addition to removing remaining voting inequalities, provided for the creation of governmental organs assuring a measure of self-government to individual territories. On August 11, 1960, Chad became an independent nation.

Under its third constitution approved April 14, 1962, the Republic of Chad adopted a presidential type of government. The chief of state has the title of President of the Republic and is also the Chief Executive. The constitution established a unicameral National Assembly with a 5-year term, an Economic and Social Council, and a Supreme Court. Election of Assembly members is by universal adult suffrage.

Chad is self-sufficient in food production, with room for expansion of both yield and acreage, and has extensive fish resources as well as an estimated 4 to 5 million head of cattle. Fish, cattle, meat, and hides constitute the principal potential for increased exports, of which cotton now constitutes 80 percent.

In planning for economic and social development initial emphasis is being given to education and technical training, the establishment of local processing industries, the construction of tourist accommodations and facilities, and improved transport within the country and to the Atlantic ports. The extensive game reserves and relatively pleasant climate during part of the year make the country potentially very attractive to tourists.

Relations between the United States and Chad are friendly. The United States maintains an embassy in Fort Lamy, and the Republic of Chad has an accredited ambassador in Washington.

At present there are no direct U.S. commercial interests in Chad; the Chadian Government hopes to interest an American company in prospecting for oil in the northern desert area. The climate for American investment in such areas as hotel construction and joint ventures in small industries—such as a tannery, a meat-processing plant, or a cottonseed-oil plant—however, is believed to be good.

Recently when I was a delegate to the 20th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it was my privilege to become well acquainted with the competent Ambassador from Chad to the United Nations, His Excellency Boukar Abdoul, who is also Ambassador to the United States.

I also had the privilege of hearing the representative of that proud country in the general debate on October 7 emphasize the need for international cooperation and harmonious economic development. It was indeed a great pleasure to me to work with Ambassador Boukar Abdoul and others in the peace-seeking tasks of the United Nations.

Year 1964 Money Income for War Veteran Families and War Veteran Unrelated Individuals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration regularly compiles information on the income of war veterans and their families. The latest information on this subject is dated December 8, 1965, and relates to the calendar year 1964.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from the text of this latest report of the Veterans' Administration:

YEAR 1964 MONEY INCOME FOR WAR VETERAN FAMILIES AND WAR VETERAN UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS, DECEMBER 8, 1965

The 1964 median family income for the 18 million war veteran families was $7,900, up $500 from the 1963 median, according to a sample survey of the 20.9 million male war veterans in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States.

Median personal income of the 1.5 million veterans living alone or with a nonrelative (unrelated individuals) was $4,400—a decrease of $300 from the 1963 median. A factor in this decrease was the smaller proportion who were under 45 years of age (44 to 42 percent)—the ages with the higher median incomes—and the higher proportion who were 70 years old and older (8 to 13 percent) where low median incomes are prevalent. The 1.4 million veterans living in a relative's household had a median personal income of $4,400 in 1964—the same as in 1963.

The highest median family income was $8,600 for the 45- to 54-year-old war veteran families, and the lowest was $3,300 for families of 75-year-old and older war veterans. Median family income rose steadily, by age, from the $7,500 received by the younger families to the peak of $8,600, and then dropped off to $3,300. Two sharp declines in the medians occurred: one for the 60- to 64-year-old war veteran families—a drop of $1,500—reflecting the early retirements from the labor force during these years; and the other for the 65- to 69-year-old families—a considerable drop of $2,500—at the normal time of most retirements from the labor force. Median family income ranged from 53 percent to 42 percent of the median for all families during the retirement years (65 years of age and over).

The 1.4 million war veterans living with a relative's family, and the 1.5 million war veterans living alone or with those unrelated to them (unrelated individuals) had the same median income in 1964—$4,400. However, in the age groups under 55 years, containing most of these veterans (85 percent of the relatives of the head, and 65 percent of the unrelated individuals), veterans living alone had higher median incomes than those living in a relative's household.

Of all war veteran families, 97 percent or 17.5 million were typical husband and wife families. These families had a median income of $7,900 in 1964—an increase of $500 from the 1963 median.

In 4 out of 10 veteran-wife families, the wife contributed to the family income by working during 1964. Altogether there were over 7 million working wives. Nearly half of the wives of veterans 45 to 54 years of age were in the labor force. Even 1 out of 5 wives of older veterans, 70 years of age and over, worked at some time during 1964. The working wives increased the family income by $1,600 on the average, and provided a median income of $8,900 in comparison with the $7,300 median family income where the wife had no earnings. For veterans 70 years and over, the wife's earnings added significantly to the level of living. Median family income amounted to $6,100 in contrast to $3,300 for families where the wife had no earnings.

Although most of the war veteran families were fairly well off, about 1.5 million families (8 percent) had money income under $3,000, the family income level used to measure the economically deprived. In one-half of the families (750,000), the veteran breadwinner was relatively young, under 55 years of age. In 1 out of 5 of these families (300,000) the wife worked, and still the family income was less than $3,000. These working-wife families were not the older families, for 7 out of 10 (210,000) of the veterans were under 55 years of age, and over one-half (110,000) were in the age group 35 to 44 years, generally considered the prime earning years.

The poverty income level for unrelated individuals (those living alone or with nonrelatives) is $1,500 or under. In 1964, about 1 out of 6 (250,000) veteran unrelated individuals had under this amount of income. Over one-half of them (130,000) were under 55 years old, and 1 out of 5 (50,000) were 70 years old and over.

Altogether, about 1 out of 12 war veteran families and unrelated individuals (1.8 million) were among the Nation's poor.

The detailed data presented in the attached tables are from special tabulations of the Census Bureau's current population survey, made under contract for the Veterans' Administration.

TABLE 1.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veteran families in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years			65 to 69 years	70 years and over				
						Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years		Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72	73 to 74	
Number (thousands)	18,045	2,713	7,891	4,699	770	248	[1] 92	156	899	825	649	468	181	176
Percent, by age	100.0	15.0	43.7	26.0	4.3	1.4	0.5	0.9	5.0	4.6	3.6	2.6	1.0	1.0
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $500	.6	.7	.5	.5	1.6	1.5	--------	.9	.3	1.1	1.2	1.6	--------	.9
$500 to $999	.5	.1	.4	.7	.3	.6	--------	.8	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.2	2.5	.9
$1,000 to $1,499	1.1	.6	.6	.7	.6	3.4	--------	3.0	4.7	4.5	3.7	4.1	2.5	6.6
$1,500 to $1,999	1.4	.3	.8	1.1	1.8	3.4	--------	4.7	6.5	5.0	4.0	3.9	4.4	7.5
$2,000 to $2,499	2.3	1.3	1.2	1.2	3.1	1.2	--------	.9	8.8	13.5	13.5	13.8	12.6	13.7
$2,500 to $2,999	2.4	2.1	1.1	1.0	2.7	6.4	--------	6.0	9.4	14.4	15.3	13.3	20.8	11.8
$3,000 to $3,499	2.7	3.0	1.3	2.2	4.0	4.6	--------	4.3	9.3	8.8	6.6	5.5	9.4	15.1
$3,500 to $3,999	2.6	2.2	2.1	1.8	4.3	2.1	--------	.8	7.6	6.5	7.2	7.6	6.3	4.2
$4,000 to $4,499	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.3	2.5	6.7	--------	7.3	6.8	4.7	5.5	4.8	7.6	2.4
$4,500 to $4,999	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.8	1.7	3.7	--------	3.8	3.5	4.1	2.9	3.2	1.9	7.6
$5,000 to $5,499	5.4	3.1	5.3	4.9	4.4	4.9	--------	6.8	5.2	2.7	3.5	3.7	3.1	.5
$5,500 to $5,999	4.1	4.2	3.9	4.3	5.7	4.3	--------	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.2	2.1	6.2	2.4
$6,000 to $6,499	6.1	7.4	6.9	5.5	4.0	5.8	--------	5.1	3.9	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.1	4.7
$6,500 to $6,999	5.0	6.5	5.2	4.9	4.4	5.8	--------	4.3	2.4	2.2	2.7	3.0	1.9	.9
$7,000 to $7,999	11.5	15.2	12.2	11.8	8.2	5.2	--------	5.1	5.0	4.8	5.4	5.8	4.4	3.3
$8,000 to $8,999	9.1	11.4	10.6	8.0	7.1	6.4	--------	8.1	2.4	4.1	4.4	5.5	1.3	3.3
$9,000 to $9,999	8.2	10.4	8.6	8.7	7.7	4.6	--------	4.3	2.1	3.0	3.2	2.8	4.4	2.4
$10,000 to $11,999	12.8	11.6	14.2	14.3	12.6	5.8	--------	6.0	6.3	5.8	4.9	3.9	7.5	8.5
$12,000 to $14,999	9.7	5.5	10.9	11.3	12.2	13.1	--------	15.0	5.2	3.3	4.2	5.7	(2)	.9
$15,000 to $24,999	7.2	3.4	7.5	10.0	7.4	1.6	--------	8.1	3.9	2.4	2.4	3.2	(2)	2.4
$25,000 and over	1.4	.2	1.2	2.0	3.7	1.8	--------	1.7	1.8	1.1	1.5	2.1	(2)	(2)
Median [3]	$7,860	$7,520	$8,280	$8,550	$8,110	$6,630	--------	$6,810	$4,150	$3,610	$3,790	$3,940	$3,330	$3,280

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

NOTE.—The distributions are shown to the nearest 1/10 of a percent for the use of technicians in combining income classes in their analyses of the data, and not to indicate this degree of accuracy. Before applying the percents to obtain estimates of the number of war veterans, the percents should be rounded to the nearest whole percent.

TABLE 2.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veteran husband-wife families in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years			65 to 69 years	70 years and over				
						Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years		Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72	73 to 74	
Number (thousands)	17,545	2,680	7,735	4,552	726	229	[1] 81	148	864	759	611	446	165	148
Percent, by age	100.0	15.3	44.1	26.0	4.1	1.3	0.5	0.8	4.9	4.3	3.5	2.6	0.9	0.8
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $500	.6	.7	.5	.5	1.7	1.6	--------	.9	.3	1.2	1.3	1.7	(2)	1.1
$500 to $999	.5	.1	.4	.6	.3	.7	--------	.9	1.4	.8	.7	.5	1.4	1.1
$1,000 to $1,499	1.0	.6	.6	.7	.6	2.0	--------	.9	4.4	4.2	3.6	3.9	2.8	6.2
$1,500 to $1,999	1.3	.4	.8	1.0	1.2	3.6	--------	5.0	6.8	5.2	4.3	4.1	4.9	7.9
$2,000 to $2,499	2.2	1.3	1.2	1.1	2.2	.7	--------	.9	9.2	13.3	13.6	14.5	11.1	12.4
$2,500 to $2,999	2.4	2.1	1.1	1.0	2.6	5.3	--------	5.4	9.6	15.3	15.7	13.2	22.9	14.0
$3,000 to $3,499	2.6	2.9	1.2	2.0	4.2	4.6	--------	4.0	9.0	9.4	7.0	5.8	10.4	16.8
$3,500 to $3,999	2.6	2.3	2.1	1.8	4.5	1.6	--------	.9	7.8	7.0	7.7	7.9	6.9	5.1
$4,000 to $4,499	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.4	2.9	7.2	--------	7.7	6.8	4.9	5.5	5.1	6.9	2.8
$4,500 to $4,999	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	1.8	3.9	--------	4.0	2.7	4.5	3.0	3.4	2.1	9.0
$5,000 to $5,499	5.4	7.9	5.2	4.9	4.5	5.3	--------	7.2	5.4	3.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	.6
$5,500 to $5,999	4.0	4.2	4.0	4.1	5.4	3.9	--------	3.2	3.4	1.9	2.1	1.7	3.5	1.1
$6,000 to $6,499	6.2	7.4	6.8	5.6	3.6	6.3	--------	5.4	3.9	2.8	2.4	2.4	3.5	5.1
$6,500 to $6,999	5.0	6.5	5.3	4.9	4.2	5.6	--------	4.0	2.4	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1	1.1
$7,000 to $7,999	11.6	15.2	12.3	11.8	7.5	5.6	--------	5.4	5.0	4.7	5.7	6.0	4.8	1.7
$8,000 to $8,999	9.1	11.4	10.6	8.1	7.5	6.9	--------	8.6	2.5	3.5	4.7	5.8	1.4	(2)
$9,000 to $9,999	8.2	10.5	8.5	8.7	7.8	4.6	--------	4.0	1.8	3.1	3.2	2.6	4.9	2.5
$10,000 to $11,999	13.0	11.7	14.2	14.6	12.7	5.9	--------	6.3	6.4	5.2	4.3	3.4	6.9	7.9
$12,000 to $14,999	9.8	5.5	11.0	11.3	12.0	13.5	--------	14.9	4.7	3.4	4.1	5.5	(2)	1.1
$15,000 to $24,999	7.3	3.3	7.5	10.2	7.5	9.2	--------	8.6	4.1	2.6	2.7	3.6	(2)	2.2
$25,000 and over	1.4	.3	1.2	2.0	3.3	2.0	--------	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.6	2.2	(2)	(2)
Median [3]	$7,890	$7,520	$8,290	$8,620	$8,240	$6,790	--------	$6,940	$4,110	$3,550	$3,760	$3,910	$3,330	$3,220

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

Of All Our Statesmen Carlson Ranks First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, a longtime member of the house and himself a distinguished Kansan, wrote a weekly newspaper column in which he paid tribute to the Honorable Frank Carlson, our respected senior Senator from Kansas.

It was my privilege to serve in the Kansas House of Representatives during Senator Carlson's tenure as Governor of my State and I have been a Member of the Congress during a part of Senator Carlson's outstanding service to Kansas and the Nation in the other body.

I heartily concur with the thoughts expressed by our former colleague, Mr. Hope, regarding the contributions which Frank Carlson has made to the lives of every Kansan and the high esteem which he has earned through more than 30 years of public service.

The following column was published in the Hutchinson News and Salina Journal and I proudly call it to the attention of the Members of the House:

Of All Our Statesmen Carlson Ranks First

(By Clifford R. Hope)

During its 105 years as a State, Kansas has sent many men and one woman (Kathryn O'Laughlin) to the U.S. Congress. Some have had distinguished careers. It is doubtful, however, if any of them have had as broad an experience in government or have contributed as much to the State and Nation as Frank Carlson.

Since his election to the House of Representatives in 1934, he has served 12 years in that body and 15 more in the Senate. In between, he sandwiched 4 years as one of our ablest Governors. Prior to his congressional service, he was in the State house of representatives for two terms and chairman of the Republican State Committee for 2 years.

He is the only Kansas Governor who also has been a member of both Houses of Congress. Only three Kansas Senators—Ingalls, Curtis and Capper, have served longer than he. A mere handful of Representatives have had longer service in the House.

When Frank Carlson went to Washington this was a Nation of 125 million people. Today it has 194 million. Its domestic and world problems have multiplied many times. The duties and responsibilities of members of Congress have increased proportionately. Frank Carlson has grown with the job.

Today he holds high rank on the two most important committees of the Senate, Finance and Foreign Relations. One deals with taxes, tariffs and trade. The other with the delicate problem of our relations with other nations in these disturbing times. He is also a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and of the prestigious Joint House and Senate Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Frank Carlson is also one on the agricultural leaders of the Senate, particularly in the fields in which this and surrounding States are interested. His membership on the Committee on Finance and Foreign Relations puts him in a position to deal with our interests as far as agricultural exports and imports are concerned. The wheat provisions of the farm bill passed this year are almost identical with bills introduced by Senator Carlson and Senator Young of North Dakota in previous years and earlier this year.

During most of Frank Carlson's congressional service, he has been in the minority. In fact, during his 27 years' in the House and Senate, the Republicans have controlled Congress only 2 years. That was the 83d Congress in 1953 and 1954 when he was just beginning to acquire seniority in the Senate. Thus Senator Carlson has never been chairman of a committee. There haven't been any important bills passed bearing his name because these honors are always given to members of the majority party. But his minority position does not diminish Senator Carlson's standing and influence. He is respected by both Republicans and Democrats and recognized by both as being a competent, experienced and dependable legislator.

Finally, and above all, Frank Carlson understands our problems here in Kansas. While keeping in mind the interests of the Nation as a whole, he never forgets that if Kansas Senators and Representatives fail to look after our interests, they won't be looked after. With him, our problems come first.

I don't usually approve attaching labels to public men. But of Frank Carlson I think it can fairly be said—that while usually a conservative, he is never a reactionary; while a believer in the two-party system, he is not a hidebound partisan; and while he has a head and uses it, he has a heart also.

Doesn't Mean Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which recently appeared in the Winfield, Kans., Daily Courier. I believe this article makes a very important point relative to campus protest movements when it states, "Where does freedom end and anarchy begin?" We should all weigh this question in our own minds in assessing the recent revolts that have sprung up upon so many of our college campuses.

The article follows:

[From the Winfield (Kans.) Daily Courier, Jan. 4, 1966]

Doesn't Mean Anarchy

"Academic freedom" is the rallying cry on the campus today.

The phrase is somewhat of a misnomer, for it does not have to do so much with the right of teachers to pursue intellectual truth as they see it as it does with the right of students to promote a particular political or social idea, to proselyte, to demonstrate and—most revolutionary of all—to have a strong voice in university policies and administration.

Initially, the campus revolt may have sprung from real grievances and have been a logical consequence of the "academic explosion"—the doubling and redoubling of enrollments, increasing competition and costs and the appearance of the "multiversity" in which some students felt they were being reduced to faceless IBM cards.

As such it was a needed and healthy breath of air amid the cloistered halls of ivy. But there is danger that the breeze is changing into a smog that threatens, at least on some campuses, to blight more than it revitalizes.

Indeed, charges one political scientist, American colleges stand in peril of being converted from academic institutions, where knowledge is transmitted and enlarged, into political institutions, where the prevailing doctrines of the day are enshrined and promulgated.

Dr. Albert Lepawsky of the University of California, on whose main campus at Berkeley the students' protest movement really got started, attacks the pressure tactics being employed by many students and not a few professors and their increasing use of the university "as a sanctuary from which to project upon society their own political preferences" under the guise of academic freedom.

Academic freedom, says Lepawsky, means more than the guarantee of intellectual integrity or political liberty.

It also includes "the freedom of members of the academic community to carry on their work unhampered by colleagues and students who engage in political activity and exert pressures to the point of disturbing the teaching, research, and other relevant functions of the university."

Unless colleges have the power to discipline themselves, he warns, to fire teachers and expel students who show by their intolerant behavior that they lack the qualities required for membership in the academic community, the result will be to "downgrade academic standards to the lowest common denominator of political conduct in our society."

Where does freedom end and anarchy begin? This is a question apparently facing not only the emerging nations of the world but the emerging university in America as well.

National Fury Might Right Some Wrongs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the Washington Evening Star carried an outstanding column by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, entitled, "National Fury Might Right Some Wrongs."

This column describes in precise terms some of the dilemnas that face our Nation. It also reflects a significant national apathy which exists in our society today. In fact, history may well record this era, not as the Great Society, but the Apathetic Society.

I commend the column to the attention of my colleagues:

National Fury Might Right Some Wrongs

(James J. Kilpatrick)

By the time this appears, the great transit strike of 1966 might be over; the city of New York will have made some further surrender to the Transport Workers Union; and an outraged city will have gone back to work.

The question arises: Will anything be done to prevent a recurrence of the outrage? And the answer comes drearily floating back: No, not really. Will the Congress now be goaded to enact laws to curb the excesses of labor unions? The answer is, no, probably not.

We have lost our capacity for outrage in this country. We have become so anesthetized with the gassy drugs of moderation and tolerance and take it easy that nothing of honest wrath remains. The strong, compulsive emotions seep away: Patriotism, religious faith, pride in the achievements of honest toil. Our houses of worship are packaged with people who go to church but miss the meaning of religion. On holidays, who flies his country's flag? We can manifest irritation, or vexation, or a fretful sense of annoyance. But sustained anger? The anger that moves and transforms? It has vanished. New Yorkers are not essentially different from other men: Most of the country would rather switch than fight.

At its peak, the transit strike was costing this great city an estimated $100 million a day. Theaters were closed. Retail sales were off. The movement of vital supplies was disrupted. Thousands of innocent and unoffending citizens were grossly inconvenienced. In the afternoons, 33d Street was jammed with strike victims, waiting to push into Pennsylvania Station. Within New York, nothing moved by public transit. An essential public service has collapsed, rendered impotent by the uncheckable arrogance of a few willful men.

If the transit workers had been genuinely oppressed, or underpaid, or overworked, it might have been a different story. If their demands had been reasonable, public opinion might have taken the workers' side. But here was a union with demands for a $680 million package over a 2-year period, a 4-day, 32-hour workweek, a 30-percent hourly pay increase, a 6 weeks' vacation after 1 year's employment, retirement at half pay after 25 years regardless of age. Mike Quill never began to negotiate seriously. Contemptuous of law, contemptuous of the public welfare, contemptuous of the rights of other men, he sought to whip the city to its knees and make John Lindsay crawl.

But who will remember all this a month from now? New York newspapers would not stand up to Bertie Powers; he whipped them singly and in combination. For the past 5 years, the country has been fed on a diet of Jimmy Hoffa. Has the Congress been moved to action? We suffer from a paralysis of the will, a flabbiness in the national guts, and we spin in rudderless circles eternally inspecting all sides of a question.

It is not a matter of organized labor alone. While the transit strike was on, the steel producers undertook to raise some of their prices, and the President responded, in effect, by using the massive powers of his office to fix a price on steel. He would agree to an increase of $2.75 a ton, but not $2.80, or $3, or $5. His will was to be substituted for the actions of the marketplace. Yet the whole incident provoked no spirited public response—not against the steel producers, as a bunch of profiteers; and not against the President, as an economic czar. The national ambivalence found something to be said on both sides, and meanwhile, the Packers and the Browns were in the third quarter, and how about another can of beer?

The Supreme Court of the United States hands down a series of opinions that deny even the most voluntary exercise of religion in the schools. The first opinion produces a wave of resentment; the second produces a smaller wave; the subsequent decrees provoke no ripple of dissent.

The High Court tosses aside a century of restraint, and undertakes to impose its novel construction of the 14th amendment upon the composition of State legislatures. Frankfurter protests. Harlan cries out in alarm. Senator DIRKSEN waves his arms. But now half the States have docilely abandoned old systems of check and balance, and no more is heard of the States' right to be masters of their own assemblies.

In almost every major city in the Nation, crime rates have climbed out of sight. Nowhere has public resentment been manifested in genuine anger or in an overwhelming demand that the public safety be restored. Traffic clogs our streets and destroys our central cities: Who is sufficiently wrought up to compel reforms? Every day brings some new account of the waste of public funds, in foreign aid, in the Job Corps, in the poverty program; and we yawn. The United States willingly supports Great Britain in imposing sanctions on Rhodesia, but last month the British increased the number of United Kingdom vessels in active trade with Cuba. Who cares?

No one denies that ours is a great and powerful country, capable of sudden generosity, of occasional sentimentality, of spontaneous sympathy or affection. But ours would be a still greater country if now and then we lost our national good humor, got fed to the teeth, and acted out of national fury to right some national wrongs.

Marines' War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, December 26, Mr. Richard Critchfield wrote an article on the civic action programs being carried on by the Marines in Vietnam. During the congressional adjournment, I visited in Vietnam and had the opportunity of visiting with most of our combat units in that part of the world. The work all of our people are doing in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia is short of miraculous.

I believe the following article is a tribute to these men and the work they are doing and I commend its reading to all in this body:

THE MARINES' WAR IN VIETNAM: A MICROCOSM

(By Richard Critchfield)

DA NANG.—To most young American soldiers in Vietnam, this country is a nightmare of mountains, marsh, and hostile villages. There are paddies and jungles where they can wade knee deep for days through searing sun or lashing rains and be shot or blown to bits at any moment without even seeing the invisible enemy.

Many GI's naturally come to feel it is a war where the frontlines are everywhere and no man with slanted eyes and a yellow skin can be trusted.

And yet as the marines here have learned from hard-won experience, it is precisely on building mutual trust with the local Vietnamese peasantry that defeating the Vietcong depends.

Now nearly 8 months after they landed in Da Nang as the first U.S. combat troops in Vietnam, the mission of the 37,000 marines is still to defend the three big airbases at Phu Bai, Da Nang, and Chu Lai. The old aim was to gradually push out their perimeters and link up all three bases in a coastal pacified zone.

VIETCONG TERROR

But today many senior Marine officers maintain that such talk of winning terrain is meaningless until someone comes up with a better formula, more money, and a lot more manpower to win over the loyalties of the Vietnamese peasants behind their lines.

The marines have now pushed about 12 miles north, south, and west of Da Nang airbase; but sizable numbers of Vietcong have begun infiltrating back behind them. By kidnaping and assassinating those who speak out for the Saigon Government, the Vietcong are trying to regain the villagers' support through terror. In this manner, they get information on Marine movements and some of their intentions as well.

On October 28, Vietcong infiltrators attacked Da Nang East airstrip and destroyed and damaged 47 helicopters, mined 2 jeeps, dynamited 7 buildings of the new, partly constructed naval hospital, and barraged a battalion of Seabees with fifty 60-mm. mortars. It seems no accident that the local village chief disappeared a few days before and that 3 weeks earlier the nearest hamlet chief was found mutilated and stabbed to death.

Such incidents have brought the Marines to the hard conclusion that as much as three-fourths of their battle ahead lies in civic action, that is, building the confidence and respect of the villagers with the aim of winning support for the government and gaining military intelligence for themselves. An imaginative civic action effort by the 2d Battalion, 3d Marine Regiment, at Le My, north of Da Nang, has been so successful the Vietcong can no longer plant even a road mine without the Vietnamese villagers reporting it to the Marines.

Elsewhere around Da Nang, the going has been tougher. How tough was brought home to this reporter this week in a visit to the little hamlet of Nui Kim Son, which lies at the foot of Marble Mountain, just south of the Vietcong's October attack.

As we drove out of the headquarters of the 9th Battalion, 1st Marine Regiment, and headed for the sand dunes toward Marble Mountain, I asked Lt. Mike Cox, the 24-year-old battalion civic action officer, how he thought the Vietnamese peasantry could be won over to the Government's side.

Mike, a redhaired Irishman from the Bronx, said, "My personal opinion? Well, it's strange, almost anything pleases these people. Seems to me whoever gives them the most will win. These people are awful ignorant but you can't judge them by our standards."

Along the rutted road we passed a series of familiar looking red and white signs:

"Don't bunch up
As you patrol about
Or you'll be picking
The fragments out.
Burma Shave."

I asked Mike what he wrote his parents about Vietnam.

WRITE VERY LITTLE

"My mother is a little old gray-haired lady and I don't want to make it any grayer. I don't write much. Dad's an old Irishman; he thinks it's all a big mess. Blames it on the French for failing to leave a government behind."

Lance Corp. Roger Michalk, 22, of Boise, Idaho, who rode along with a rifle just in case, said he wrote home as little as possible. "Just enough to keep 'em from writing the commanding officer to find out whether I'm dead or alive."

The biggest concern the marines had, said Mike, were the university student demonstrations back home in the states. "I dislike the group that does it," he said. "They're looking for some kind of moral absolution, to wash their hands of these people's troubles. They're trying to go back to the Middle Ages, turn the university into a sanctuary and shut out the world. That's no good." Mike said he graduated in philosophy from a small college in New Jersey.

Marble Mountain, a jagged out-cropping of white rock rising about 1,000 feet out of the sandy coast and covered with lush green vegetation, loomed just ahead of us. An immense staircase of discolored white marble curved up the mountainside through dense foliage with strange crimson and yellow blossoms and huge waxen leaves.

MONKS TEND SHRINES

After a strenuous climb, we reached a Buddhist monastery where several monks were pruning rose bushes in a walled garden. All but one had pallid, ivory complexions; the marines said the monks spent most of their time tending religious shrines in the underground network of caves and grottos that led deep into the mountain. The single exception was a tall, ruddy and vigorous-looking Vietnamese in a maroon monk's robe who was smoking a cigarette. He said he was a disciple of Thich Tri Quang, the Buddhist leader of Hue. He motioned for us to follow him down a forested trail which led up to the mouth of a giant cave. Outside was a huge statue of Buddha's mother, gray and eroded with weather and green with moss. A group of six Vietnamese men came out of the cave and passed by; they were unsmiling and looked steely eyed. "Vietcong?" "Probably just tourists," said Mike.

We followed the monk into the cave and after a short walk forward through the damp darkness stepped down into a huge cavern. "It's beautiful," Corporal Michalk exclaimed.

The cavern was immense, perhaps 60 feet high; shafts of sunlight fell from cracks in the marble ceiling above; the marble floor glittered like water. Dragons with lionlike heads and huge bearded stone warriors with scimitars guarded the entrance. Across the gloomy shadows and the haze of incense a giant Buddha sat, green and silver as the cavern walls, grinning and empty handed, like all Buddhas. Water dripped from above and was echoed from falling water deep within the series of black caves that led off the central chamber.

Mike whistled. "Shangri-la. Ronald Colman will come out any minute." The drip, drip, of the water, the cloying odor of incense and the silence of the tall monk were unsettling. "We'd better give the old padre a couple of piastres and go," Mike said.

FEARED AMBUSH

We hurried down the mountainside fairly rapidly since the lush foliage along the winding staircase provided perfect cover for an ambush. The corporal said that in the evenings back at battalion headquarters you could hear the monks beating a big gong from somewhere inside the mountain. "It's an eerie sound and in an irregular pattern. I bet it's some kind of signal."

Two little boys, stonecutters who made their living carving pilgrims' initials into the marble steps, talked the corporal into having his name immortalized on the mountain. As we paused Mike said: "These kids are fabulous. The VC came into Nui Kim Son one night and wanted to know how many marines were up at the outpost on the mountain's peak. The kids said more than 100, too many for the VC to handle. When the VC found out they had lied, they came back and beat the kids until their legs were black and blue; they could hardly walk afterward."

As we walked down into Nui Kim Son, Mike explained that almost all of its people made their living sculpting little figurines out of marble from the mountain. Even though it was Sunday, groups of men and women squatted on the dirt floors of their huts, chipping away. Their wares were arranged on shelves in front of each hut—lunging tigers, reproductions of the Virgin Mary, and grinning little white marble Buddhas.

Mike said the people of Nui Kim Son sold the figures in Da Nang for cash and then bought their food from the farmers to the south.

A Vietcong battalion had been garrisoned just south of Marble Mountain until the Marines reached there in August, and the 7th Vietcong Regiment just 3 miles to the south. Now several Marine companies had routed the Vietcong but these still had to be resupplied by helicopter or with an armored convoy of tanks; the roads in between were mined and everything south of a bridge just below Nui Kim Son was still pretty much Vietcong country.

"Nui Kim Son just got caught between the VC and the government and couldn't move. The VC told the villagers south of here not to come in and trade and to keep away from the Marines. They'd like to choke off the people from us so we won't get intelligence. But the people come into the market from VC territory anyway. We spray the market with DDT and keep the flies away and they like that. It seems to me if you can open an economy in a place the people will respond to it, no matter what the VC say."

I suggested we stop for a coke at one of the village teahouses but Mike said, "We can't trust them. One minute they're smiling from ear to ear and the next selling pop with acid or ice cubes with glass slivers. One guy's still in the hospital."

One shack had a life-sized cardboard figure of a buxom girl draped against a harp propped up outside as advertising. Someone had torn the nose off. Inside two pretty Vietnamese girls in slacks were waiting for customers. The single room was sparsely furnished with cheap lawn chairs, a table, and wash bucket and some cases of beer; a red curtain hung across an alcove. When I asked what was behind it, Mike said "probably a bed" and the girls giggled something about "Mama san."

CHANGE ARMY OUTFITS

We lifted the curtain aside; it concealed a Buddhist memorial shrine to the dead. The faded protograph of a thin little Vietnamese boy in spectacles was set above the altar. The girls volunteered, "Boom, boom, die." Pull back almost any curtain in Vietnam and you'll find human suffering.

"All these girls pay VC taxes," Mike said as we walked down the street again. It's hard to tell people back home what the war in our area is really like. Pan Am stops in Saigon not Nui Kim Son. The national government to these people is nothing; they've never heard of Saigon. We want the Vietnamese to come in here. Get the government to come back with nurses and civil affairs people.

"ID cards don't mean a damn thing out here. Many people carry both VC and government identification. Then a lot of the government's NCO's get their training and go off and join the VC. And some of the VC join the government army. These guys change outfits like a suit of clothes.

"Another problem you've got to overcome is being a white man. These people were all Viet Minh, many of these men knocked off French soldiers. They didn't like the French. One old man told me, 'You're better than the French, you treat us better. But I don't like you Americans. You have too much money, you're rich, you think we are stupid and undeveloped.' But its something when they start telling you stuff like that. It means they have the freedom to criticize and they know it."

NEED MEDICAL AID

Mike said three of the village chiefs from the area to the south lived in Nui Kim Son. "Actually the chief of this village was captured 2 weeks ago. He went south of the bridge and didn't tell anyone. His uncle was supposed to be a big VC. Trinh, the chief of Hoa Hai village, lives within our battalion's perimeter now. About a month ago two VC came in and threw a bomb in his house. Trinh saw him and shot at him. He's got more guts than Superman. He says the VC was a hardcore terrorist who chopped off the right hand of a number of children from pro-government families in the neighborhood."

Mike said one big need, he felt, was medical aid; a good program might be to take thousands of Vietnamese back to the States or to secure areas and give them crash courses in basic medicine.

"These people need so much. We got books from the Embassy and I wrote home for some maps, you have to scrounge around. These kids here had never seen a geographical outline of their own country. But each area is different. You just can't have a formula for everywhere. For instance, these people south of the bridge sometimes use North Vietnamese money with Ho Chi Minh's picture on it."

We had reached the end of the hamlet and crossed the road into an old long-abandoned French fort the Marines were using as a supply dump. If the grotto on Marble Mountain had been Shangri-la, this was Beau Geste. Carved on the weather eroded stone walls were ghostly messages from its successive occupants, "March Forward, Comrades" and "Brave Men Died Here" in Vietnamese; the single word, "fear," scribbled in French by some forgotten Legionnaire and "San Antonio, Tex.," the latest addition.

PLAYS CLASSICAL RECORD

"Good living," said Mike, "but nothing like the Air Force up on Monkey Mountain; they've got flush toilets and movies."

The present commander of the fort, Marine Lt. John N. Rogers of Washington Grove, Md., a graduate of George Washington University, told Mike he had a new Antonio Vivaldi record and invited us up to one of the ruined towers to hear it. One of the radio men was shipping a new stereo home from the Da Nang PX and we could play it on that. The lieutenant put on Vivaldi's Concerto in C Minor for Flute."

As the sound of mandolins, flutes, violins and a harpsichord burst into the tower, Lieutenant Rogers grinned, "This movement sets the mood for the third; it comes out with all its joy."

Mike sank into reverie. "It's almost a year since I heard music like that. It takes you back to listening midway through the book review section on a Sunday afternoon with a cup of fresh coffee, lighting up a good cigarette."

For a moment the music seemed to wash away the constant tension and the treacherous world of enigmatic monks, soda pop that could mean painful injury, and terrorists who mutilated little children.

The slit in the stone wall was like a postcard in an 18th century Venetian landscape: great towering cumulus clouds, cobalt blue sky, pine trees, white sands, glittering marble cliffs, a golden little Buddhist temple with pink arched roofs, children bathing in a green pond, the wind rippling the water's surface, transparent dragonflies against the dim blue outline of the Annamite Cordillera's lumpy peaks. Then two whirring helicopters, like monsters out of science fiction, flew into the postcard and the present came rushing back.

"Don't stick your head up too much near that slit," Mike said. "There's VC snipers out there."

Hawaii Businessman Combines Idealism With Business Acumen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I am sure my esteemed colleagues will agree that in our modern industrial world, man's efforts to give form and substance to his ideals is a seemingly impossible task. We therefore admire any man who is able to bring together his idealism and his practical business acumen. And we are further impressed when this fusion is made in a project which would contribute culturally to our American way of life.

I am proud to call attention to one of Hawaii's foremost businessmen, who has undertaken this difficult task and has already attained a great measure of success. He is Mr. Masayuki Tokioka, president of National-Braemar, Inc., which was formed to spearhead the ambitious business and cultural center in San Francisco's Japanese-American community. National-Braemar combines Honolulu's National Securities and Investment Co. with Braemar Associates, a Los Angeles development concern.

Mr. Tokioka, a 1927 graduate of the Harvard School of Business Administration, in an interview with Mr. Charles A. Ware, assistant managing editor of the Honolulu Advertiser, said that his decision to undertake the huge project involved idealism as well as business considerations. Born of alien Japanese parents who came to Hawaii in 1898, Mr. Tokioka explains his views thus:

> Japanese Americans have gained much from the United States. Now we can do something for America. If we don't contribute in this way, we are not doing our duty.

A manifestation of this idealism is a concrete Peace Pagoda which will be erected on the 1.5 acre shopping center.

I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Ware's article on the phenomenal success story of Mr. Masayuki Tokioka, which appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin-Advertiser of November 14, 1965:

HE GREW WITH THE COMMUNITY

(By Charles A. Ware)

Masayuki Tokioka, operating head of a group of six local investment and insurance firms whose combined assets now approach $40 million, is a quiet-spoken, slightly built man who is given to conservative dress and to very unconservative dreams.

The important thing is that his dreams have a way of coming true, no matter what the obstacles and delays.

The latest is a $15 million Japanese Commercial and Cultural Center in the heart of San Francisco—a project that now is under construction after nearly 5 years of planning and negotiations.

Its central feature is to be a 100-foot Peace Pagoda, a gift of the Japanese people, which is Masayuki Tokioka's special dream.

WORKED HIS WAY UP

All of this seems an astonishing achievement for an immigrant boy from Japan who once trimmed lawns in Honolulu and helped his father deliver plants by horse and wagon from a little family-operated nursery in Waikiki.

Yet Tokioka remains modest—almost diffident—about his rise in Honolulu's business world. "It's not because of any special ability," he declared last week. "Just say that our companies have grown with the community. That's what our story has been."

Tokioka was born May 22, 1898, in a farming area of Okayama Prefecture, in southern Honshu.

Just about that time, his father came to Hawaii for what was intended as a fairly brief visit to study sugarcane culture here. (A small quantity of cane was being grown on a family farm in Japan, and the father, Tozo Tokioka, hoped to learn how to make it a more successful venture.)

"But my father fell in love with Hawaii," Tokioka said. "He never went back."

Tokioka's mother and an older brother, Bunji, joined the father here at the turn of the century, but Masayuki remained with relatives in Japan until 1909. Then he, too, was brought to the islands, completing the family reunion.

CONTEMPORARY QUARTERS

As he recalled his boyhood in Waikiki, Tokioka leaned back in his chair at the modern headquaters of International Savings and Loan Association.

His modest office, only steps from the Savings and Loan public area, is furnished in contemporary style.

His own desk, likely to be piled high with current operating reports of the companies he heads, dominates the room. Behind is a long countertop cabinet with a special recess for rolls of blueprints and architectural drawings. Within an arm's reach are file drawers filled with detailed statistical and financial reports.

Five of the six companies that Tokioka heads are housed in the International Savings and Loan Building at King and Bethel Streets. The other is next door.

The arrangement, he says, "makes possible some operating economies we wouldn't have otherwise."

Father Tozo Tokioka probably wouldn't have spoken in those terms when he came to Hawaii, but he obviously did have a strong business sense and a sound feeling for efficiency.

When he decided to remain in the islands, Tokioka said, "My father didn't have much capital.

"He knew that one big problem in any kind of merchandising was excess stock. That's why a merchant has to have an annual sale, to reduce his investment in items that don't sell," Tokioka said. "Nowadays, the annual clearance seems to come every 6 months, or even every 3 months," he added with the trace of a grin.

"Well, my father looked around, and decided that in a nursery you would get around this, because the unsold stock would continue to increase in value instead of depreciating.

"Then, too, he came from a farming district, where the soil was the thing—the earth and the sky, and growing things bringing them together."

The nursery was well established, located on land that now is part of the Hilton Hawaiian Village site, when young Masayuki arrived in Honolulu.

RAPID ADJUSTMENT

He slipped quickly into the life of his contemporaries, attending school, helping with the family enterprise, and finding time for outdoor fun as well. And presently he was at McKinley High School, where he "made the team" in football, playing fullback, and achieved a scholastic record that allowed him to enter the University of Hawaii.

It was at the university that he made two important decisions. One was that he would enter business, and the other that he would prepare himself with the best education in the field that he could obtain.

"At that time," Tokioka recalled, "many young men of Japanese origin were seeking to better themselves by entering the professions, becoming doctors or lawyers.

"I just did not want to be a doctor; I knew I wasn't suited for it by temperament. And because I could not then become an American citizen, I knew I would be greatly restricted as a lawyer. So I decided upon a business career instead."

At the start of Tokioka's junior year, a young instructor named Gerald R. Kinnear joined the faculty of the university's commerce department, fresh from winning his master's degree at the Harvard School of Business Administration.

Kinnear, later to become treasurer of the University of Hawaii, was highly articulate and persuasive.

He impressed local audiences with a series of public talks on business subjects, including one on benefits that might result from establishment of a "free port"—comparable to the foreign trade zone that today is about to begin operations.

And he impressed his students with the excellence of the Harvard business school.

THE VERY BEST

"I felt that if I were going to invest money and my time in graduate study, I ought to try for the very best," Tokioka said.

"Kinnear had told us we would find it difficult to get in and even more difficult to get out—to graduate. That made it seem a challenge, and I was determined to go if I possibly could," Tokioka said.

He did "get in," and when he "got out" in 1927, he was one of the first if not actually the first student of Japanese ancestry to be awarded the master of business administration degree at Harvard.

In an aside, Tokioka recalled that "when I left the University of Hawaii, I was greatly interested in international trade and commerce. The thing in which I was least interested was insurance and finance." He spread his hands. "So here I am * * *

"Back on the east coast in those days, they hardly knew where Hawaii was. So I was something special, coming from such a far-off place, and I'm pretty sure I got some special breaks because of that," Tokioka said.

"Special breaks" or no, his scholastic record was good, and as graduation neared he and his classmates were interviewed by representatives of major corporations seeking junior executive talent.

IMPORTANT ADVICE

"The dean of students made a talk to the class then, and he gave us some advice that I've never forgotten," Tokioka said. "I have passed it on to young men many times since.

"He told us that it is fine to look to a big company for success and advancement. But he said not to forget that you can find success in a small company, also.

"In a big organization, you're apt to be stuck in a corner at first, and you have to face strong competition for any advancement, while in a small company you are likely to have more responsibility from the start, and if you really are something you have a chance to show it."

That turned out to be the course that Tokioka followed.

"When I came back to Hawaii I didn't have any preconceived ideas about where I wanted to work or where I would apply," he said. "Then, one day, a friend said International Trust Co. was looking for a young trained person. So I applied, and that's how I came to start there."

Both International Trust and International Savings & Loan were young companies, both founded by the same group, who as individuals were affiliated with leading firms in the Caucasian and Japanese business communities of the time.

The founders hoped to achieve two goals: To retain in Hawaii a larger share of the savings of Japanese immigrants, who traditionally transmitted their funds back to their homeland, and to make available a new source of longer term loan funds, particularly for Japanese businessmen.

First president of both firms was Wade Warren Thayer, attorney-businessman, a onetime newspaperman, and former territorial attorney general and secretary of Hawaii.

Tokioka's first years with the trust company were active.

VARIETY OF ENDEAVORS

Soon after he began work there, he and two young associates bought the Newfair Dairy, then located on Kapahulu Avenue. Their downpayment, he recalls, was borrowed from his elder brother, who by then was a doctor here. Tokioka retained a principal interest in the dairy and an active role in its management until 1946, when it was sold to Dairymen's Association.

Meanwhile, in 1928, the trust company sent him to the big island for a year as manager of a Hamakua coffee plantation.

By 1930, he was cashier and chief accountant for International Trust. And in that year, on August 2, he married Miss Harue Fujiyoshi of Maui, a senior at the University of Hawaii.

A new company in the growing family of related firms, National Mortgage & Finance Co., Ltd., had been organized in 1929 to deal in personal loans, real estate mortgages, trade acceptances, and general financing. Tokioka was one of its vice presidents.

National Mortgage in 1930 named International Trust Co. as its fiscal agent, and the arrangement continued for nearly 5 years. But then their positions were dramatically revised.

International Trust, which had weathered the depression years successfully, in 1935 became the victim of conflict between the foreign policies of the United States and Japan.

This was the era of "the Manchurian incident" and establishment, under Japanese sponsorship, of the State of Manchukuo. The United States opposed the entire expansionist movement, and did not recognize the new Government.

In Honolulu, the directors of International Trust, including citizens of both countries, found they could not resolve questions of company policy without coming into conflict with the official position of one nation or the other.

"Rather than let bitterness develop over this conflict, the directors, decided to dissolve the company and part as friends," Tokioka said.

National Mortgage & Finance took over a number of the functions of the trust company, including some of its insurance agencies and its role as fiscal agent. It now operates in many respects as the overall management and service organizations for the entire group of related firms.

EXPANSION

The list of these companies grew with the incorporation of Island Insurance Co., Ltd., late in 1939, which now writes all lines of general casualty and fire insurance. Its subsidiary, Tradewind Insurance Co., Ltd., was formed in 1955.

National Securities and Investment, Inc., was chartered in 1958, and the following year joined with Daiwa Securities Co., of Japan in establishing Daiwa Securities of Hawaii, Inc. The new firm is one of two major brokerage houses in the islands specializing in the securities of Japanese businesses.

Through these years, Tokioka continued to advance in the various companies. He had become acting manager and secretary of National Mortgage and Finance in 1932, later to be named executive vice president and then president.

He was elected president of Island Insurance in 1957, and in 1959, after the death of Thayer, president of International Savings and Loan Association.

QUITE A HISTORY

The three-story concrete International Savings and Loan Building was built in 1940 by International Enterprises for the House of Mitsukoshi, a major Japanese department store chain.

When it opened in the fall of that year, one of its greatest attractions was its escalator—the first in the territory. This was a one-way installation, traveling up only, from the first floor to the mezzanine, but every youngster in town sought to ride it in the months it was in operation.

In World War II, the building became a major USO center, and soon after the war the regional office of the Veterans' Administration was established there. The VA remained in that location until 1959.

International Enterprises merged with National Mortgage and Finance Co. in 1958, and soon afterward an extensive remodeling and renovation program was undertaken to convert the old House of Mitsukoshi to the modern International Savings Building. It was completed in 1960.

It was in that same period, too, that the huge San Francisco project was conceived.

DREAM COMES TRUE

Tokioka recalls that three Japanese-American businessmen called on him "out of the blue" to ask assistance. An urban redevelopment project was proposed, they, including what had been the Japanese business center of the city.

The idea of establishing the new business and cultural center there had wide acceptance in San Francisco's Japanese-American community, they reported, but no one had been able to get the project under way.

After studying the plan, Tokioka agreed to join in backing the center, through National Securities and Investment Co. That firm, with Braemar Associates, a Los Angeles development concern, formed National-Braemar, Inc., with Tokioka as president, to undertake the project.

There were many delays, including one caused by debate over design of the Peace Pagoda. (It finally was agreed that it will be a contemporary concrete structure, designed by Prof. Yoshiro Taniguchi of the University of Tokyo, architect for the palace of the Crown Prince.)

Finally, however, ground-breaking ceremonies were held last March 18, and the firm of Haas & Haynie, the general contractor, estimated completion in 18 months.

The center's facilities are to include a 13-story hotel, a 1-story building for local businesses, a 1.5-acre shopping center, a 2-story trade center building, a theater-restaurant, and underground parking facilities for 800 cars.

CULTURAL CONTRIBUTION

The decision to enter the huge project, Tokioka admits, involved idealism as well as business considerations.

"The American culture comes from many sources, and this is its strength, this combination of the best from many different nations and many different cultures," he said.

"Now, Japan can contribute to America and its culture, and enrich it further."

He thinks that the process already is under way, given its greatest impetus by the postwar occupation of Japan. "Many, many Americans then were brought into close contact with the Japanese culture for a time, and now the results can be seen all across the country, especially in architectural influences," he said.

Tokioka wants to see the trend continued and strengthened.

"Japanese Americans have gained much from the United States. Now we can do something for America. If we don't contribute in this way, we are not doing our duty," he said simply.

Informational Picketing of Nonunion Restaurants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech given by the owner of a nonunion restaurant in which he explains a problem experienced as a result of informational picketing by some of the union representatives trying to enforce the restaurant employer to become unionized. The speech is self-explanatory and may be helpful to some of my colleagues who are interested in legislation to correct such unfair and improper practices.

The speech follows:

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss for those who are already familiar with informational picketing, and to enlighten others who are not. Also, we shall discuss and explore the alternatives that we have, as businessmen, in the restaurant industry, in fighting this so-called informational picketing which is nothing short of legalized blackmail, supported by existing laws. At the moment, and since November 4, 1965, continually, from 7 a.m. until 2 a.m., our Old Angus Restaurant and Rob Roy Lounge, in the Holiday Inn, 17th and Rhode Island Avenue NW., is being picketed by a group of professional picketers, paid by the union to carry placards that read, "To the public: Please do not patronize Old Angus Restaurant and Cocktail Lounge. Old Angus Restaurant and Cocktail Lounge has no contract with our union. This restaurant pays substandard wages and has substandard working conditions. Please do not patronize Old Angus Restaurant and Cocktail Lounge." It is signed by Joint Executive Board of the Hotel & Restaurant Employees & Bartenders International Union, AFL–CIO of Washington, D.C. In addition to that, handbills were passed continually, to all pedestrians which read very much the same.

Our first reaction in seeing the picketers in front of our restaurant door was one of confused and mixed feelings, since we were totally uninformed and didn't know the first thing about this type of picketing. As a matter of fact it was nearly a month later that we finally learned all about informational picketing, recognitional picketing, organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, unfair labor practices, union contracts, sweetheart contracts, National Labor Relations Board decisions, etc., etc.

This powerful weapon in the hands of the union which is entitled "Informational Picketing" was enacted into law by Congress on September 14, 1959, under the title "Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959." The purpose of the act, then, was to eliminate illegal picketing of business establishments by unions forcing them and their employees to sign a contract with the union, even though the union did not have 51 percent of the employees' representation.

The law passed giving the union the right to recognitional picketing if 51 percent of a company's employees informed the employer that they wished to be represented by the union and the employer refused to recognize that. However, the labor lobbyists were successful in tacking a proviso to the amendment which reads, and I quote, "That nothing in this subparagraph shall be construed to prohibit any picketing or other publicity for the purpose of truthfully advising the public, including consumers, that an employer does not employ members of, or have a contract with a labor organization."

Now, gentlemen, you have just heard the exact opposite of what the law intended to do in the first place. On one hand, Congress passed a law forbidding unions to picket an employer without employee majority wishing to join the union; yet, on the other hand, the same law says that it's alright to picket an employer, carrying placards and informing the public that it has no contract with the labor union. Gentlemen, this is the union's weapon and the ironic part is, that even though they've had this weapon in their hands since 1959, they decided, little over a year ago, to use it and successfully, I might say, and they make no bones about it. Through the grapevine, word comes out that they intend to organize every restaurant in town, whether the employer or the employees want it or not, and one by one, they say, we will all fall.

At this point, you may ask, "How can they picket, trying to organize you when it's illegal, the law says?" The union, during this picketing, no one, none of them, is talking anything except, "We don't want to organize anybody. We are merely informing the public. It is our right." This is when the ridiculous game starts: we, the employers trying to prove to the National Labor Relations Board and the Government that the true purpose of their picketing is not to inform the public, but to actually force us to force our employees to join their union, which in itself is illegal, since the law clearly states that no employer shall force any of his employees, against their will, to join any labor organization.

So, the picketing continues. The frustrations, aggravations, general harassment and economic boycott that this picketing brings upon an employer is absolutely exasperating, to say the least. You feel helpless, feeling that this legalized blackmail by the unions can take place in a free country like ours and you, the employers, the businessmen, the taxpayer and one of the sustaining members of our society have no rights and nowhere to go and tell your side of the story. Some of you may ask, "Well, what's so bad about the union?", or, "What effect would it have on our business if the union is successful in organizing our employees with us operating under a union contract?" Briefly, I will try to give you a few examples. In quoting our attorney who once said, "Once the union is in the restaurant, you have a partner." And that, gentlemen, is exactly what would happen if we lost to the union. In addition to an approximate 10-percent increase on your weekly payroll due to the union's demands, you will have to contend with the union's interferring in your business and in your decisions in trying to run your business successfully. When you have to give your cooks three bottles of beer daily, because the union says so, you can imagine what that alone could do to the efficiency of your kitchen operation if your cooks should report to work with their usual hangovers; all they would need to be reactivated again is a bottle of beer. Or imagine you, the boss, making a rule in your place of business and you expect your employees to observe it and instead you find yourself arguing and fighting with the shop steward (who would be the spokesman for all your employees) because he happens to disagree with the rule that you issued. Or, a busboy, or any of your employees, dropping a tray of dishes in the middle of your dining room and while you are telling him to help clean it up, he is telling you that it is not his job and that you should get your porter to clean it. And, to top it all, I have heard of a case where a union employee was fired three times for being drunk on the job and the union forced the restaurant to reinstate him every time. As a matter of fact, you could hardly fire anyone, except on rare occasions.

Now, I ask you, how long our industry would survive under those conditions?

Our industry is plagued by hundreds, if not thousands, of irresponsible and incompetent employees. One of the keys to our success and very survival in our business has always been the ability, on management's part, to dictate policies or make swift changes in personnel where situations deemed it necessary. The union has no place in our industry; particularly nowadays, when competition in our industry is keen and the main product we are all selling is still service and service is nothing else but the attitude and the way our employees perform during the course of our operation, and that, gentlemen, the most important, or, I should say, the heartbeat of our business, will be in the hands of the union if we should fail to face facts and try to fight hard in winning this battle that could mean our success or failure in our business.

If the union is successful in organizing the entire restaurant industry in Washington, we will find ourselves in such predicament of having to negotiate, every year, a new contract with the union and, every year, the customary union exorbitant and unreasonable demands will be asked from us, to be delivered without regard or concern, whether we could afford them or not. The only recourse that we will have in meeting their unreasonable demands would be: (a) cutting quality, (b) reducing portions, (c) reducing payroll, and (e) increasing prices. All these moves, if forced on us, are tailor made to eventually put us out of business.

The stakes are high and anything we attempt to do individually in countering the union's efforts will undoubtedly fail, since strength, which the union has, cannot be challenged with weakness, which one individual operator would represent. However, the union strength can be challenged successfully if all of us stand together, united, presenting a strong front in meeting and dealing with this dangerous problem that is threatening our business.

Thank you very much.

What We Don't Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, which effectively points up the reservations which many Members of Congress and responsible journalists have regarding Federal subsidization of our free press, even in the name of fighting poverty. The editorial follows:

WHAT WE DON'T NEED

One of the unlikeliest proposals in a long time was made in Washington the other day.

One of the city's community action centers has asked for $150,000 in antipoverty funds to enable one of its clients to start an eight page weekly tabloid newspaper.

What this country does not need is a federally subsidized press, on no matter how small a scale. If the young man who has made application has sufficient background and experience to operate his own paper, he will have no trouble finding a job on an already established newspaper. If he doesn't have those qualifications, even the Federal Government would have trouble keeping his head above water in so competitive a field.

Moreover, there's enough management of the news in Washington without giving the Government a proprietary interest in a newspaper.

We Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, for years now, I have contended that West Virginia has been repeatedly been misrepresented by newspaper and magazine articles circulated nationally which depict my State as filled with barefooted, feuding, uneducated, and culturally starved people.

The latest example, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, is found in a recent issue of Look magazine which carried an article describing a West Virginia family in Randolph County as facing a bleak Christmas.

How true was this article?

Legwork by Jim Comstock, astute editor of a West Virginia weekly, brings out that the head of this family admitted he had accepted $100, more than a year ago for posing for pictures and authorizing this article, which only recently made its appearance.

To me, an apology from the editors of Look magazine to the people of West Virginia is in order.

Just how poor is this West Virginia family?

For the benefit of my colleagues, here for the record is an editorial on this by the weekly newspaper, Republican-Delta of Buckhannon, W. Va., ably edited by Herbert Welch.

WE VOLUNTEER

Jim Comstock down Richwood way often has some wayout ideas—like his "Sexual Behavior of the Richwood Female," or like calling his Hillbilly weekly magazine a newspaper, although it makes no effort to supply spot news.

But every once in a while he comes up with a good idea. In Hillbilly magazine's Christmas edition, he came up with two good ones.

First, he does a masterful job of debunking the Look magazine piece of fiction which purported to present facts upon a Randolph County family facing a bleak Christmas.

Second, he recalls that he did a similar sob-sister story on life in Harlem following another "Poor West Virginia" piece a few years ago in the Saturday Evening Post.

Jim points out that Look should take another look at the family of Coleman Currence, an ADCU worker who takes home $160 a month, who has free hospital, dental and medical services, who gets 70 percent of his groceries free while his children get free hot lunches and school transportation—and who pays no taxes.

The Mill Creek State road worker admitted to Jim that he accepted $100 from Look in return for posing for pictures and authorizing the article a year ago. Just how Currence knew a year in advance that Santa would miss his family in 1965 is not explained.

In his article Jim weeps for Currence who, as Look points out, has to walk maybe 3 miles to work—and as a result, as Jim points out, "can't hardly coon hunt all night some nights."

But enough about the coon hunter, his wife and eight kids. Look has already said more than enough in libelously maligning West Virginia. It's Jim's second idea which intrigues us now.

Jim recalls his expedition to Harlem to report factually the living conditions there. Suppose every West Virginia newspaper were to send feature writers and photographers to cities all over the country. Suppose they were to look for only the worst, just as Look did and just as Saturday Evening Post did. Suppose just 50 of West Virginia's newspapers published these articles simultaneously so everybody in West Virginia could feel sorry simultaneously for the people of every other State and in the District of Columbia.

This might not be as exciting, Jim, as the "Sexual Behavior of the Richwood Female." But it could be a great deal more constructive. The Delta volunteers to be a part of any such expedition which might be organized. And we'd like either Washington, D.C., or Austin, Tex.

Louis Seltzer Retires as Editor of Cleveland Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, announcement was made last Friday of the retirement of Louis Seltzer as editor of the Cleveland Press and of the appointment of Thomas L. Boardman to succeed him.

The following front-page story carried the news to Press readers last Friday, January 7:

SELTZER RETIRES—TOM BOARDMAN NAMED EDITOR

Thomas L. Boardman will become editor of the Cleveland Press Monday, succeeding Louis B. Seltzer, who today announced his retirement after nearly 50 years of service with this newspaper.

Boardman, 46, was named editor by Jack R. Howard, president of Scripps-Howard Newspapers. The new editor began his newspaper career as a copyboy on the Press in 1939 after his graduation from Oberlin College.

Boardman returns to Cleveland from Indianapolis, where he was editor of the Scripps-Howard newspaper in that city, the Indianapolis Times, from May 1962, until it was discontinued in October of last year.

He will be jointed later by his wife Cynthia, and their children, Thomas J., 17, and Caroline, 15.

Seltzer steps down after 37½ years as editor of the Press and will take on, in his words, "the simple task of a citizen of greater Cleveland."

Boardman has nearly 20 years of experience as a Cleveland newspaperman and as an active participant in civic activities. Except for 5 years of service in the Navy during World War II, he was a Press staff member from 1939 to 1962 when he went to the Indianapolis editorship.

At the Press, he advanced steadily—copyboy to labor reporter, to assistant city editor, to editorial writer and to chief of editorial writers.

"It is quite impossible for me fully to express my personal and professional pleasure in returning to Cleveland and to the Cleveland Press," Boardman said.

"This community and this newspaper always have had much in common. They have shared the same hopes and the same dreams—and they have shared the same struggles.

"To bring these hopes and dreams to reality, the Press and the community have shared the same devotion to integrity in government, to decency and fair play in human relations, and to the exercise of energy and daring in dealing with the tough problems of a big and growing metropolitan area.

"I had the personal good fortune to work with and learn from Louis B. Seltzer over many years.

"Now it is my further good fortune to continue what he has done, and at the same time to rejoin good friends on the staff of the Press and throughout this community.

"Needless tc say, these are opportunities for which I am deeply grateful."

An early story about Boardman back in the forties said that when he first came to the Press, "he was a quiet young man, tall, thin, and sandy haired."

Associate Editor Norman Shaw recalls that Boardman came to the Press staff as a result of a call from Prof. Ben Lewis, of the economics department at Oberlin, who suggested Boardman as a very promising bright young man.

Boardman was editor of the Oberlin Review and had qualified as an alternate Rhodes scholar.

The new Press editor was born in Arcadia, Mo., and attended schools there and elsewhere in the Midwest before entering Oberlin College.

He went on duty in the Navy in May 1941, as yeoman; came out in 1945 as a lieutenant commander after demolition and bomb disposal duties all over the war areas of the world. He is now a captain in the Naval Reserve.

As chief editorial writer of the Press, Boardman was frequently called on for speeches. Before the Ohio Municipal League in 1961 he set forth a credo for a modern metropolitan attitude.

"Too many municipalities have fallen into the belief that what is to be will be, the old status quo notion that if a city is meant to progress it will progress and if it is meant to decay, it will decay.

"This is the dreary, gloomy line of the fainthearted.

"The truth is that the growth and development of our municipalities is controlled just as much by the alertness of its leadership as it is by the shifting of economic patterns.

"To believe that change, good or bad, is inevitable, is at best to invite a dreamless sleep and at worst to die."

During his years with the Press in Cleveland, Boardman was involved in many civic and professional activities. He was president of the City Club and later treasurer of the City Club Forum Foundation.

He was president of the board of trustees for the Golden Age Center and a trustee on the board of League Park Center. He was chairman of the recreation board of Shaker Heights.

Boardman also was a trustee of the Advertising Club. For several years he taught a news writing class at Cleveland College.

He was a member of the Cleveland Rotary Club and Mid-day Club. For several years he served as a member of the Cuyahoga County Library Board.

JACK HOWARD HAILS SELTZER

Jack R. Howard, president of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, flew into Cleveland today from California to be with Louis Seltzer on the editor's last day at the Press.

In a statement Howard said:

Louis Seltzer's devotion to Cleveland is exceeded only by his devotion to the calling he has served so faithfully and brilliantly for more than half a century, 37 of those years as editor of the Cleveland Press.

The Press' contributions to the Nation and Ohio, and particularly to Cleveland, stand as tribute to these twin devotions and hence as tribute to Louis himself, who would ask for nothing more.

Louis is retiring as editor of the Press as dictated by business policy, but he is not retiring from the stream of life whose many and complex currents so intrigue and interest him.

His experience and wisdom will continue to stimulate the thought of Scripps-Howard newspapers which have benefited from them over the years. For this we are all grateful.

His successor, Tom L. Boardman, is himself, in a way, a tribute to Louis' wisdom and foresight. For Louis early recognized and developed in Tom the man who would someday take his place. That day has come, and leadership now passes with no slackening of pace.

The Plight of the Little Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the recess, in traveling about my part of Michigan, I was of course pleased to note the general feeling of prosperity, but was dismayed to observe the number of truly small businesses that have closed their doors; small merchants on the main streets of country towns. I am certain this condition is not peculiar to my district but is general throughout the Nation. The really small businessman, managing his own store, running his own shop, employing a few people, has been much more than a symbol of enterprise in the rural communities of America.

Much of the plight in which the little businessman finds himself today is due to governmentally imposed regulation. No one outside these groups of doughty competitors realizes the economic burden which a multitude of increasingly complex reports for governmental agencies casts upon them. Burdensome and equivocal regulations, sometimes misinterpreted by Government employees in the field, to impose impossible economic burdens, have been enough to drive the smallest enterpriser from the ranks of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that a business enterprise never stands still. In business you either go forward or backward. These small business people do not complain about the rigors of competition. They are willing to take their chances with their competitors. Their plea is to be freed from Government regulations written with big business in mind, which overburden them but are taken by their bigger competitors in stride as part of overhead.

In recent months I have received several letters from small businessmen in my district making this plea. Among them is a letter from Fred Koning, a restaurateur in Douglas, Mich., within my congressional district. The Saugatuck-Douglas area is one of Michigan's fine summer resorts, and Fred Koning, in a long-established business, has been successful thus far. But he writes me as follows:

> During the last three decades, we have seen fit to subsidize the world, the farmer, the laborer, the Negro, the poor, including the ones that could work but won't. There are families that have prospered on relief.
>
> On the other hand, the Government has guaranteed big business a profit by letting contracts on a cost-plus basis.
>
> Have the powers that be ever considered the little businessman? I don't mean the small businessman; I mean the little ones, like myself.
>
> We have never asked for nor wanted any subsidies. All we want is a chance to survive. How many of the legislators who are so concerned with the welfare of the masses have ever been in a competitive field and have had to earn a living by competition, let alone meet a payroll?
>
> Wouldn't it be possible to think of all of us instead of the select groups they have seen fit to sponsor?
>
> As little business people, all we ask is the right to run our own business—sink or swim—and pay our taxes.
>
> Respectfully,
>
> FRED KONING.

Mr. Speaker, we would do a better job at lawmaking, and the bureaucracy would write fairer regulations, if the concerns of little businessmen were taken into account. All big business started small. The man or woman who has an idea and the ability and courage to venture it in competitive enterprise still contributes much to our progress; and Government should take care in its laws and regulations that an economic, political, and social climate encouraging small business is fostered.

A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the January issue of the magazine Navy, published by the Navy League of the United States there is an article which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues. This article consists of excerpts from a speech by Capt. James E. Heg, U.S. Navy, and is entitled "A Call for a Public Awareness of U.S. Maritime Plight."

Captain Heg, in his speech, calls upon the public to awaken to the facts about the critical state of our merchant marine. He astutely points out the fact that the Soviet Union is planning a modern automated merchant marine and that it is ironic that we as a nation compare all of our forms of power to that of the Soviet Union with the exception of our merchant marine power.

Mr. Speaker, within a few years, Captain Heg points out, the Soviet Union will be in a position to dominate the sea lanes and he leaves it to his readers' speculation as to what such a situation could portend for the United States. He goes further by pointing to the great amount of money that is being spent in other areas of transportation.

This article points out that since the Merchant Marine Act was passed in 1936 that the United States has spent more on the development of one single aircraft than it has in all 29 years in the area of merchant marine development. As a matter of fact, during 1966 the U.S. Maritime Administration is slated to spend no more than the minuscule sum of $250,000 on research and development toward advanced ships and systems. Compare this with what we are spending for air transportation and other means of defense.

I commend this article to my colleagues.

Reagan's Top Secret Wasn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the Washington Post on January 11, 1966, regarding the efficient spy apparatus operated by Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown of California.

While all may be fair in love, war, and politics, it would seem to me that there should be a limit to the complete disregard of ethics. I feel that Governor Brown breached all ethical standards in this feat of political espionage and that he showed a lack of morality in this undercover operation.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 11, 1966]

REAGAN'S TOP SECRET WASN'T

(By Gerry Robichaud)

LOS ANGELES, Jan. 10.—It will never go down as any great shakes in the annals of California crime. But as a feat of political espionage, it left the Ronald Reagan camp severely shaken and the forces of Democratic Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown somewhat smugly self-satisfied.

The fact is that one or more of Brown's undercover agents managed to infiltrate the Reagan security apparatus.

The agents surreptitiously obtained an advance copy of the top-secret television scenario in which Reagan announced his candidacy for the Republican gubernatorial nomination. This enabled Brown's own campaign organization to issue a point-by-point "refutation" of what Reagan had to say several hours before Reagan's half-hour political show, which had been taped in utmost secrecy, was presented to a 15-station California audience.

How the security breach was engineered remains a mystery. But those who tried to reconstruct what happened feel that it would require at least 24 hours for the Democratic Coordinating Committee, which is pushing Brown's third-term bid, to prepare its detailed analysis of Reagan's script and its answers thereto.

If the "crime" did occur as early as is now generally supposed, that would rule out an inadvertent leak to the Brown forces through the news wire services or other media—for none had the full text of Reagan's TV speech until a short time before it was aired.

Indeed, most reporters had received the Democratic commentary on Reagan's remarks considerably before getting the Reagan text from his campaign handlers.

Who Wants To Win?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk of "hawks" and "doves" and thousands of self-appointed "experts" expound on U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

In the January 9, 1966, issue of Our Sunday Visitor, Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., expresses some important historical facts and excellent conclusions which I commend to the attention of the Members of Congress:

RIGHT OR WRONG: WHO WANTS TO WIN?

(By Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD praised the cease-fire on Christmas Day, expressing the hope that "perhaps it could be stretched further." House Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK expressed the hope that "the cessation will restore reason to the Communists."

We hear a great deal about a cease-fire, about negotiations, about ending the war, and about getting out of Vietnam. Unfortunately, all four of these can be treacherous. The cease-fire, for example, has been a major Communist weapon in the cold war for a generation. When the Communist armies in China were weak, after World War II, Mao Tse-tung arranged for a temporary cease-fire on the mainland, with the United States serving as the moderator. Of course, the Communists could not be controlled, but General Marshall insisted that the Nationalist troops observe it.

When Chiang Kai-shek complained that the Communists were not observing the cease-fire, George Marshall replied: "Never mind, you keep it, so you can come to the conference table with your hands clean." Chiang's hands were clean, but the Chinese were cleaned right out of their country. The phony cease-fire enabled the Chinese Reds to arm themselves with former Japanese weapons, and to keep on conquering.

LEARN FROM MISTAKES

When the Communists faced defeat in Korea, they asked for truce talks. Because of the talks, the United States halted its big drive to the north. The Chinese talked and talked until they had built up their forces and reinforced their positions. The buildup meant that it would have been much more costly for the United States to resume fighting. Uncle Sam had been put in a much weaker bargaining position, and we ended up with an agreement so weak that the Communists broke it at will. One of the keenest and most experienced military minds in American history, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, had said repeatedly that there is "no substitute for victory," but our diplomats refused to listen.

How often must the American military shed their blood and give their lives in the defense of freedom throughout the world, only to have American statesmen fumble the peace through timidity and fear? Of the 33,000 American soldiers who died in Korea, two-thirds were killed after negotiations began. Yet our roving Ambassador, Averell Harriman, said he told the Russians last June that "we will not stop bombing the North until negotiations have started."

Shortly before Mr. Harriman went to represent the United States at the Geneva Conference over Laos in 1962, he told the Reverend Raymond J. deJaegher: "We have to give some places on the Lao Government to the Communists." Mr. Harriman was trained at Yalta and has reflected that training ever since.

The negotiations over Laos were used by North Vietnam to strengthen its military positions. Harriman agreed, for some strange reason, to remove Laos from the protection of the SEATO Treaty. Had we not forced a coalition government on Laos, just as we had done on Nationalist China, there might well be no war in Vietnam today. We must learn from our mistakes, or we will keep on repeating them.

During the last 20 years the American Government seems to have taken military decisions almost entirely away from the military. In these same 20 years America has lost sight of victory. When the Secretary of Defense remarked recently from Saigon that he was "surprised" at what the Vietcong are doing, it is because he is not a military man and knows so little about how to win a war. The administration never talks about having the aggressor surrender. We only want him to talk to us, and we hold out concessions to encourage the enemy to "negotiate." Our policy is still one of weakness, instead of strength.

People in foreign countries are astonished that America cannot seem to win a war aganst 180,000 invaders, even with the help of 600,000 South Vietnamese troops. Our civilian strategists tell us we are not winning because it is a totally different kind of war. But it is basically the same type of war we fought during World War II in the Pacific. Our enemy then was 50 times more formidable. The only real difference is that General MacArthur fought to win, and he had the authority to do so; something that was denied him in Korea, something that is denied to the Joint Chiefs of Staff today. For example, they wanted to blockade the harbor of Hanoi but were overruled.

WE CAN WIN

If MacArthur had been allowed to defeat the aggressor in Korea, the Communists in Asia would hardly have started another war so soon. They have never doubted we can beat them. They only doubt our intention to do so, and they have good reason to doubt it. In the past they have been able to influence us with their propaganda. Their approach has changed, but their propaganda is just as effective as ever.

A year ago our Commander in Chief made a statesmanlike decision when he decided to abolish our policy of sanctuary. His decision saved South Vietnam from being conquered, and for this he will go down in history. What is needed now is a decision to win the war. Not a cease-fire based on mutual concessions, as Senator Fulbright has suggested; not negotiations based on a compromise of justice; not a bargaining away of the rights of others; but a just and lasting peace based on the surrender of the aggressor. In the words of Gen. Thomas A. Lane:

"The idea that forbearance increases the prospect of a negotiated settlement is an illusion. American lives are being squandered in Vietnam, just as they were in Korea. As in Korea, the Communists are quite satisfied to chew up American forces in a protracted war of attrition."

Can we win? Of course we can, and the Communists know it. But we never even talk about winning, and the Communists are not convinced we really want to. America has never lost a war, but for 20 years we have been vainly seeking substitutes for victory.

The Honorable Homer Thornberry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, December 7, I had the honor of attending the annual Dallas Chamber of Commerce banquet and the guest speaker was our former colleague, Homer Thornberry who is now judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals of the Fifth Judicial District of Texas.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include Judge Thornberry's remarks:

Remarks of Judge Homer Thornberry, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Judicial District, at Annual Dinner of Dallas Chamber of Commerce Honoring Members of Texas Delegation in Congress Tuesday, December 7, 1965

This is a significant day—significant for two reasons. First, it is the anniversary of Pearl Harbor, and we are reminded once again of the sacrifices made by a great many in order that we can enjoy countless privileges as Americans. Secondly, today marks the 125th anniversary of the founding of the city of Dallas, and you have chosen this day to honor some of the best friends I ever had.

Anyone who has been privileged to serve with this great Texas delegation would be pleased to be here tonight to join you in honoring them. That is why—when my longtime friend, Dale Miller, called me—I felt that everyone would understand it if I would lay aside the judicial robes and rejoin, for a while, the camaraderie this association calls to mind.

It is possible for me to do so because you have made this an entirely nonpartisan affair. You are gathered on a community and civic basis to pay honor to a great team of distinguished Texans who represent this State in the Halls of Congress. Such an occasion as this is in the finest traditions of a great State whose people have long respected public service.

It is tragic, but it is true, that not all State delegations in Congress can gather together or even rally together. This delegation can, and all of us are proud that it can.

It can gather and rally together because it is made up today of men who have the judgment and the capacity to work together for those things on which they are agreed and yet to take opposing views when their individual judgments dictate they must, without reflecting on the motives of those whose views are different.

It would be difficult to overstate the depth and the current of the friendships that service in this delegation generates. It is not an exaggeration for me to say that outside my parents' home and my own home, I have found no other association so rewarding. Let me hasten to add, lest I be misunderstood, that I am not announcing for office again.

The opportunity to serve in this delegation, to cast my talents with theirs, to represent my district and my State alongside my colleagues; to face, with these men, at times of crisis and the times of victory, to wait with them through the nights of sorrow and despair for the mornings of hope and the days of success—all these things have made me appreciate how richly a man is endowed when he learns to work in a partisan environment without rancor, when he is able to accept defeat without recrimination, and when he can share victory without jealousy.

For every occasion such as tonight, there are many occasions that are quite different.

There are those who always find fault. If a Congress writes into law a large part of the platform on which it ran and the recommendations of the Nation's President, some spitefully call it a rubberstamp Congress.

However, when it shows great independence and spurns the President's recommendations and rejects the party platforms, it is dubbed a "do nothing" Congress.

A Member of Congress works harder than do most of his fellow Americans. He is a statesman when his critics agree with him and a lackey of the pressure groups when they disagree with him. These days the blind critics of the Congress sometimes speak louder than do its judicious observers.

But the judicious observers are being heard, too. And they say that what the Congress needs is support, understanding, and appreciation. A Member needs his constituents' considered advice, not their veiled threats. He needs their judgment of what is best for the country, not their demands for what is beneficial to a few. He needs their rejection of attacks on the institution of the Congress when it strives to equip and staff itself to meet the demands of the times.

He needs your trust and support when he gives you honest and faithful service. In this way a State builds a tradition of service which in itself strengthens its delegation in the Congress and extends its influence in the counsels of the Union.

The late Speaker Sam Rayburn's wisdom and understanding were a legend in his lifetime. He left our State a heritage of many treasures. One of these is his record of the longest service in our Nation's history as Speaker. Consider that during his service in the Congress, Mr. Rayburn served with a Texan who became President, two Texans who were Vice President, two Texans, including himself, who were Speakers of the House, one Texan who was majority leader of the Senate, and two Texans who were leaders of the House. Our greatest pride is in having a native son in the White House. Our pride is not so much related to the fact that President Johnson is a Texan as it is to the faith and confidence we share in his masterful leadership.

I believe in the right to express our opinions, the right to differ, the right to petition, and the rights of the minority. As a matter of fact, I think, even more than we have in the past, as Americans we need to support these rights. At the same time I think we need to recognize that the Constitution of the United States names the President as the Commander in Chief and vests in him the responsibility to guide our foreign affairs.

I remember Mr. Rayburn when he said that President Eisenhower was our leader—"that if he was not our leader, as President of the United States, we had no leader"—and that in the conduct of our foreign affairs we should support him to the best of our ability. The President of the United States needs our trust, our understanding, and our prayers as he tries in this difficult time to find a way toward peace and stability for the men and women of the world.

But when Texans look east from the White House—down Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol—there is another source of great pride in our State.

There this Texas delegation continues its leadership in both Houses of the Conress. The U.S. Senate, where Tom Connally, Morris Sheppard, and Lyndon Johnson entered as young men, now hears the strong voices of Texas' senior Senator, RALPH YARBOROUGH, and junior Senator, JOHN TOWER.

The House of Representatives rarely debates any bill which has not come to the floor of the House through a committee on which Texans have powerful positions of leadership and trust. It would not be possible, on this occasion, to detail them all, but consider these things:

Of the 20 standing committees of the House, the chairmen of 4 are Texans.

On these same committees, the first ranking member below the chairman is a Texan on four of them—with only one overlap—and the second ranking member on yet four more is a Texan.

Even this does not include the many subcommittee chairmen, the many special committee chairmanships and memberships represented in this delegation.

Above, beyond, and quite aside from these formal offices of leadership, this delegation has a place of honor and trust within the Congress. It is variously referred to in Washington as "the powerful Texas delegation" or "those hard-working Texas Congressmen" (and here I use the term in its broader sense, to include both Houses of Congress)—or some other term descriptive of the impact of this group. One remarkable fact about these men is that because they number among their members, like as well as sometimes diverse views, and yet can work together, they are able, as a team, to carry your representation into all the counsels and before the entire membership of the Congress.

Truly, for you, for me, for our State, and for our Nation, the service, the talent, the experience, and the leadership represented here justly earns our appreciation.

Those of you who have made this occasion possible, have by your very act somewhat lightened the burden these men carry.

Strong leadership in the Congress, supported by an appreciative and understanding people, makes for a bedrock on which the torch of freedom may long burn.

Quarrel With Louis Seltzer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have no wish to quarrel with my longtime good friend, Louis Seltzer, who is retiring as editor of the Cleveland Press after a 50-year association with that great newspaper.

I never thought that I would have to point a finger at a flagrant error in reporting on the part of one of this Nation's most brilliant journalists.

But I must.

Louis Seltzer's farewell editorial in January 7 edition of the Press declares, "I write the traditional '30' to a career in journalism."

Those of us who know and admire Louis must chide him with fond respect for that statement. It just isn't so.

There is no "30" for a career which has had such dynamic and worthwhile influence on literally millions of readers.

There is no "30" for a young and energetic mind which will continue to probe and uncover and bring to the printed page sound solutions for knotty problems.

There is no "30" for a man whose good works, noble ideals, and countless benefactions will outlast all of us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I now include Louis Seltzer's beautiful editorial, asking only that readers discount the first sentence of the last paragraph:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 7, 1966]

L.B.S. WRITES "30"

(By Louis B. Seltzer)

Another name replaces mine at the top of this page with Monday's issue.

It will read, "Thomas Boardman, editor."

It will be the first change of name in that spot in nearly 38 years.

The man who relinquishes the title of editor assumed it when he was 30. He is now approaching 69. For a half century he has worked exclusively for this newspaper, lived for it, fought for it, dreamed for it.

He had help. He had the best group of men and women throughout that period any editor in America could conceivably wish or have. They made the Cleveland Press. They helped make it one of what Time magazine not long ago listed as among the 10 best newspapers in America.

With Tom Boardman, one of the ablest journalists in America, on the bridge of this journalistic ship, it will sail on to greater glory and achievement. Of that I am sure. He will make Greater Cleveland proud of him. He will make the Press proud of him. He will make the men and women of the Press proud of him.

As I take my leave of the newspaper which has been my sole professional life for 50 years I set aside one title and assume another.

I will be proud to wear for the rest of my life the simple title of "Citizen of Greater Cleveland."

For that is what I intend to be, to live here, to be at the side of Marion's and my family, to work for it, dream for it, and everlastingly fight for it. This is a great city. It will be greater than ever in the future. It is on the way. It needs all the help and inspiration all of us can give it—our sweat and sinew, our dreams and hard work, our faith and our greatest hopes.

Marion in her gentle way used to say she didn't know which came first in my life, the paper, the city, or herself. She said that but she knew which came first. No one ever doubted that. But the other two, the city and the paper, were so inextricably intermingled I never knew for sure which was which.

And now that someone else will guide the paper's destiny I will devote my effort and my love for it to my home community—the community in which I was born as a child in a struggling family, and which endowed me with those qualities, such as they were, that enabled me to stand up in the race of life these many years.

Some men and women at the Press at whose side I worked through the years are still here. Many more have gone. Some are editors of other newspapers and magazines. Others are in different professions and business. The Press alumni are scattered all over America. I am proud of them.

I am most proud of those who are still here. They have been the stalwarts. They have given of themselves as much or more to this paper than have I. They have always been at my side.

From the Scripps-Howard Newspapers, of which the Cleveland Press was the first, and which today is preeminently the foremost newspaper group in America, I have had throughout the almost 38 years as editor the utmost support, cooperation, understanding, and latitude in adapting it to the especially sensitive requirements of this vast and wonderful community. At no time have I ever been inhibited or circumscribed in the use of whatever judgment or enterprise was needed for doing that which was either essential, desirable or called for.

For the past 15 years I have had the blessing of one of America's ablest newspaper business managers in George E. Carter, whose candid, searching, cooperative qualities have strengthened and buoyed me immeasurably. He has stood solidly at my side.

One other was at my side. She is no longer here, and yet she is—ever present, stimulating, inspiring and beckoning me on, and on, and on, always as she did. I look up to her today as I always did—and always will.

For her I thank God. For the opportunity to be editor of this newspaper through so many of its exciting and significant years I am thankful. For the privilege now of serving my city as a citizen in any way, shape, or form I may, I will also be grateful.

I write the traditional "30" to a career in journalism. I will now write the book I have been requested to write—and bend my back and put my muscles and sinew to the community's plow to help furrow its future.

Time of Reckoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, the El Dorado Times, Eldorado, Kans., for January 5, 1966, had an excellent editorial entitled "The Time of Reckoning." With a full-scale war looking us in the face, I think this Congress must face up to its responsibilities and take another hard look at the Great Society programs which we enacted with little thought, and less debate, during the first session of this Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

TIME OF RECKONING

Despite rumblings of a Federal tax boost this year to pay for the war in Vietnam, a first-page story in recent afternoon newspapers carried the news that the President is unlikely to ask Congress to take such action in 1966—an election year.

For the same reason, Congress—which is always politically skittish—is also unlikely to respond to any call for new taxes.

The rumors still persist, however, and hang like a sword over the heads of taxpayers who have finally come to the conclusion that whatever happens to them will be unpleasant.

In fact, what Adlai Stevenson called the moment of truth has finally arrived for the present administration. After 5 years of unparalleled national prosperity, during which the country sailed along on plenty with the goose hanging high, the time of reckoning has come to pass. The United States, richest country on earth, finds itself seriously overextended.

The Hutchinson News, which was friendly to President Johnson during the election last year and still is, comments pertinently as follows:

"Lyndon Johnson wanted, and nearly got, everything at once. He wanted to get to the moon the day after tomorrow, to settle the Communists' hash in Vietnam, abolish racial discrimination, eliminate poverty, care for the sick and the aged, educate the young up to today's capacities, beautify the countryside, restore cities, have prosperity without inflation, and be conservative in fiscal matters.

"It won't happen that way, simply because it can't. We haven't enough horses to gallop in so many directions.

"One can't fault the President for trying. Indeed, national neglect over the past two decades bred such a sense of national urgency.

"But one must begin to ponder the serious imbalance between our commitments, at home and abroad, and our intellectual and moral assets."

Furthermore, the Hutchinson newspaper observes that the "administration gets the highest marks for a valiant fight to preserve fredom, maintain world stability, promote justice and relieve suffering at home. But it has not yet demonstrated the capacity for matching the good fight with the price, mostly in manpower, necessary to pay for tomorrow."

With a new budget of over $100 billion coming up, after Congress last year appropriated expenditures of, at least, $118 or $120 billion, it is natural that as the war expands a few severe headaches now prevail on the Washington front.

Seventy-one Percent Think Congress Is Doing a Great Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, as the 89th Congress convenes again I think it is proper that many of us take pride in noting the acceptance by the American people of our efforts during the first session in 1965. A poll by Mr. Louis Harris, that appeared Sunday, January 9, in the Washington Post, revealed that 71 percent of the American electorate gives a favorable rating to the job done by Congress in 1965.

Because the term "rubberstamp" is being bounced about politically, I would like to suggest that this poll indicates the American people have put the rubberstamp of approval on the legislation of the first session. I also would like to suggest that if those of us who supported this legislation are "rubberstamps" for the administration then the Republicans who opposed it consistently are rubberstamps for the Goldwater position so overwhelmingly rejected by the American voters in 1964.

The story outlining the poll results follows:

Seventy-one Percent Think Congress Is Doing a Great Job

(By Louis Harris)

When Congress reconvenes this week, it will be riding the crest of the highest public approval registered in modern times. Fully 71 percent of the American electorate gives a favorable rating to the job done by Congress in 1965. This compares with only 35 percent who felt this way 2 years ago, shortly after the death of President Kennedy.

The reason for the increase in the widespread and almost uniform praise that now abounds in the country for the legislative program adopted after President Johnson took office.

Medical care for the aged, considered by the public the most important to them personally, now is backed by 82 percent. Federal aid to education, judged the second most important piece of new legislation, is supported by 90 precent. Cutting excise taxes, third in the list of popular priorities, is looked on favorably by 92 percent.

It is evident that many of last year's most controversial measures have been accepted and even become popular.

In fact, Congress has impressed the people so much that it is more popular than the President—four points higher than the Chief Executive's last recorded positive rating at 67 percent.

A carefully drawn cross-section of the public was asked:

"How would you rate the job Congress did this past year in 1965—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

[Percent]	*Excellent, pretty good*	*Fair, poor*
December 1965	71	29
December 1964	64	36
December 1963	35	65

The most dramatic gain in popularity for Congress was recorded in the South, while its top overall rating continues to be in the East. Here is a regional breakdown of those who rate Congress positively:

[Percent]	*Dec. 1965*	*Dec. 1964*
East	79	69
Midwest	66	65
South	66	49
West	66	62

In 1964, the South was still smarting over civil rights legislation. A year later the pulling power of other legislation apparently has rehabilitated Congress' reputation.

The public was also asked:

"Now, I want to hand you a list of bills passed by this last Congress. For each, tell me if you approve or disapprove of that bill from what you know or have heard of it."

[Percent]	*Approve*	*Disapprove*
Voting rights for Negroes	95	5
Cutting excise taxes	92	8
Federal aid to education	90	10
College scholarships	89	11
Medical care for the aged	82	18
Highway beauty	79	21
Anti-poverty program	73	27
Immigration based on individual skill rather than country quota	70	30
New cabinet post, Secretary of Urban Affairs	67	33
Supports and payments for farmers	62	38

Not only is there solid endorsement of the major bills passed by Congress, but those with the highest public approval also tend to be considered the more important to voters personality. The cross section was asked:

"If you had to choose one bill, which one would you say is most important to you personally?"

[Percent]	*Most important*
Medical care for the aged	28
Federal aid to education	21
Cutting excise taxes	18
Voting rights for Negroes	14
The antipoverty program	8
Immigration revision	3
College scholarships	3
Farm program	2
Department of Urban Affairs	2
Highway beauty	1

The widespread public approval of the 1965 congressional record could have important implications for the 1966 off-year elections. Despite new-found levels of confidence, however the Democrats cannot count on any automatic repeat of 1964's smashing victories in the House and Senate.

Bellamy Award Address by David Henry of Waterloo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, representing the State of Iowa and West Waterloo High School at the 24th annual Bellamy Award presentation to the State of Delaware at the Pierre S. du Pont High School in Wilmington on October 13, 1965, was David Henry. His school was the Bellamy Award winner in 1962.

I am also pleased to note that this young man is one of two students to receive a silver Americanism medal for the outstanding manner in which he served as an ambassador of his school, community, and State.

The excellent Bellamy Award address by David Henry reads as follows:

On behalf of the nearly 2,000 students of West High School, Waterloo, Iowa, the 1962 Bellamy Award winner, I wish to congratulate Pierre S. du Pont High School upon the accomplishments which have resulted in the achieving of this outstanding award.

At West High our school motto, duty, honor, service, is our goal. All of our school activities can be classes under these three categories. First comes our duty: Our duty to our school, our community, our teachers, and our fellow students. Last spring when Waterloo was faced with the threat of serious and extensive flooding, the students of West and the three other high schools of Waterloo joined in the successful effort to save the lives and property of those in our community. The similar action of our students in 1961 was one of the criteria for our selection as a Bellamy Award recipient in 1962.

Under honor, we at West have many areas of concern. The school paper, the Spectator, has won several Freedom Foundation awards and twice this year was recognized for its 16-page spring fashion issue and its editorials by the Newspaper Fund Incorporated sponsored by the Wall Street Jornal. Our metals class won first place in the Iowa Industrial Arts Fair with a class project. West has won the State wrestling title for

6 of 15 years and has been runnerup for 5 years. Our athletic, speech, and music departments have excelled in their respective areas for many years.

Under the area of service, our future nurses club sends volunteers to the Waterloo hospitals during the year, and many of our students hold offices of responsibility in community organizations.

These, then, are the goals of West High School, duty, honor, and service. May the fundamentals which they represent be upheld by the students of the high schools in the Bellamy family, for it is through these basic ideals that freedom and democracy, at home and abroad, will be perpetuated. Congratulations, Pierre S. du Pont High School.

How Not To Help Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include, as part of my remarks, a story from the Appleton, Wis. Post-Crescent which tells, better than I can, how the Government should not help depressed areas.

Briefly, after Government intervention in its economic life to the tune of over a half a million dollars, one depressed Wisconsin community is now worse off than when the Government-inspired operation began.

It is not necessary to point out, I believe, that Republicans warned against this job-killing effect when the Area Redevelopment Act was under consideration. Unless we get sounder administration of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, we can expect similar contraproductive results under that law.

The article follows:

BANKRUPTCY FILED—FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED PAPER COMPANY DIES QUIETLY IN TOMAHAWK

(By Dick Lyneis)

TOMAHAWK.—Death struck quietly and without fanfare here last week in this economically depressed northern Wisconsin community of 3,300 people.

It wasn't a usual death; it was the demise of a paper company that began operations on the strength of a $414,000 Federal Government loan, subsisted with another $150,000 loan from the Government, hoped to thrive on the strength of a Federal Government contract, and finally ended with bankruptcy papers filed with a clerk of a Federal district court.

Critics of the idea upon which Tomahawk Paper Co., Inc., was launched, and there were many critics, aren't surprised; they say the plan was ill-conceived and doomed from the beginning.

But people in this small town, where unemployment is a big problem, don't care why a big plant sits idle, they're only concerned about the money they personally invested in what they thought might be a bright future and about 50 people who are now receiving unemployment checks.

PEOPLE STUNNED

The people here aren't bitter, but they are stunned. An attorney, who himself purchased stock in Tomahawk paper firm and who served for a short time on the company's board of directors, summed up reaction this way:

"If anyone else ever comes in and tries to sell the town on an idea like this, they're going to have a hard time trying to get anyone to listen to them."

The community's investment in the financing of the firm which manufactured low-cost toilet tissue was significant.

People here began listening when John Anderson, who had been the chief cost accountant for Peavey Paper Mills, Inc., Ladysmith, along with Dennis Kichefski, Peavey's plant manager, and Chester Adamczyk, a Peavey engineer, approached the Tomahawk Area Development Corp., with their proposition for starting a tissue mill.

The three men sold their plan and, with the help of Democratic Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, secured the initial $414,000 loan from the Federal Government's then Area Redevelopment Administration. A local and a Milwaukee bank put up a $129,000 mortgage loan, the development corporation put up another $64,000, and another sum was raised by selling stock to several townspeople.

ANDERSON NAMED PRESIDENT

A board of directors was formed and Anderson was elected president of the firm, Kichefski was named vice president and general manager, and Adamczyk became secretary. This was in May of 1963.

Operations began, but working capital grew short in the summer of 1964 and another Federal Government loan was arranged; this time a $150,000 participation loan with the Small Business Administration (SBA) putting up 83.3 percent of the total and the balance coming from a bank.

More working capital was needed, but, according to Anderson, when the SBA approved the $150,000 loan, officials of the agency said "this is the end of the line." Anderson said, "the Government has been awful businesslike all the way through. We tried to raise money from other sources, too," he said, "and we were told we didn't have the record of stability and earnings to win confidence."

But help came from the Federal Government in a different way. Tomahawk Paper bid for a Government contract to supply tissue for military and civilian sources. Tomahawk's bid was low. However, as in all General Services Administration (GSA) procurement contracts, a GSA inspector must examine the product before delivery to see if it meets specifications. The GSA inspector came to the plant, and decided the tissue paper didn't meet specifications. Specifications couldn't be changed once the contract was let. As a result, what had been hope became one of the principal causes of failure.

PAPER INDUSTRY ALARMED

When the project was launched originally in 1963, spokesmen for the paper industry and some politicians were alarmed by the Federal Government's involvement.

One of the most influential critics, Eighth District Republican Representative JOHN W. BYRNES of Green Bay, released a statement to the Post-Crescent after learning about the paper company's failure:

"I take little personal satisfaction in having warned against the Federal loans which made this ill-conceived venture possible. The losses and suffering in Tomahawk which will be caused by the closing of Tomahawk Paper Co. are tragedies which give pleasure to no one.

"I can only repeat what I said in February 1963: 'This is a perfect example of Government bungling and waste.'

"The ARA and SBA were warned that this enterprise, because of economic factors, had little chance of success. In the face of these warnings, these two agencies pumped hundreds of thousands of dollars—taxpayers' dollars—into this company, sucking along tens of thousands of dollars of local funds.

"WILL BE REPEATED AGAIN

"The sad fact is that the story of Tomahawk will be repeated again and again as the attempt to substitute Federal benevolence for sound economic judgment brings on more failures in the so-called redevelopment areas."

Anderson said here last week that is wasn't a lack of sound economic judgment that caused the company to fail, "but a concerted effort by other paper companies to squeeze us out because of our Federal financing.

"The best way to eliminate future competition," he said, "is to squeeze it out at the start.

"When we began the project," Anderson said, "The whole paper industry was booming, but by the time we were ready to start, the whole market picture had changed. Several large mills expanded and cut into our potential market. Georgia-Pacific opened a new plant in Arkansas and began manufacturing a low-priced tissue which it sold in the South. Then Fort Howard and Sterling (paper companies) lost much of their market in the South and began selling up North in what we had considered our primary market areas."

At this point, Anderson explained, Tomahawk Paper changed its line and went into the industrial tissue field.

QUOTED LOWER PRICES

"All this time," he said, "our sales force had to compete with salesmen from other paper companies who followed our people into customers' offices and quoted prices 50 cents a case cheaper than anything we offered.

"But, nevertheless," Anderson stated, "when we shut down we had enough orders and contracts to carry us for 2 years. It was not a lack of business that caused our problems, but the lack of ability to produce enough."

Asked how helpful Senator PROXMIRE was in getting the original Federal Government loan. Anderson said. "He didn't do as much to help us as some people say. His office was just the contact point for us in Washington. We got the loan because the ARA has designated Lincoln County as having excessive unemployment.

"In fact," he added, "we had over 400 applications for the 50 jobs that were available."

Asked to comment on claims that the officers had paid themselves excessively high salaries, Anderson said, "We never gave ourselves an increase since we started. Each of us lost between $10,000 and $20,000 on this venture. We lost everything we had saved all our lives and I'd say that personally, this was a hell of a blow."

FREE ENTERPRISE HELP

Although they are stunned, people in Tomahawk haven't given up—they expect that free enterprise may bail them out. Several people here say that at least two Fox Valley paper companies are interested in buying the plant and equipment.

"I would expect" Anderson said, "that within a month arrangements will have been completed to reopen the mill."

Today, telephone service has been disconnected to the snowbound mill and a sign hangs on the front door which reads—"this office temporarily closed."

If it opens again, someone else will have to turn the key. "Right now," Anderson said as we left, "I'm looking for a job. Do you know where I can get one?"

Salute to Sudan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, the Republic of Sudan celebrated the 10th anniversary of her independence. As you are aware, the 2d session of the 89th Congress had not yet convened. However, I did not want the opportunity overlooked to extend to the people and the Government of Sudan the warmest felicitations of this country on this occasion. Congratulations are therefore extended on this occasion to His Excellency Ismail el Ezhari, the President of the Supreme Council of State; and to His Excellency Abbash el Obeid, the Sudanese Ambassador to the United States.

Traditionally, most Americans anxiously await the end of an old year and look forward to the approach of the new year in anticipation of prosperity, progress, and peace. But January 1 has even more significance to the people of the Republic of the Sudan.

It was on this date in 1956 that this huge country was proclaimed an independent and sovereign state. Comprising an area almost one-tenth of the African continent, this young and dynamic Republic is a land of more than 12 million inhabitants.

However, it should be noted that while the Sudan is celebrating its 10th anniversary as an independent Republic, its historical legacy goes back very far indeed. Ancient Egyptian inscriptions and references in the Old Testament—to the Land of Kush—bear evidence of the Sudan's past greatness. During most of the 19th century, the Sudan was under Turkish-Egyptian subjugation with a short period of independence between 1885 and 1899. Following the joint British-Egyptian reconquest of the country in 1896–98, a new governmental system had to be devised. This resulted in joint Anglo-Egyptian administration or condominium, as the system was called.

The Sudan is a land of sharp contrasts, divided between the economically developed Moslem north and the largely pagan and Christian underdeveloped south. However, strong efforts are being made to overcome these and other handicaps.

Sudan's somewhat small and scattered population and lack of known resources has forced the country's economy to remain primarily an agricultural one. Cotton is the mainstay of the Sudanese economy, and accounts for approximately 70 percent of the country's total exports and about 30 percent of the total world production of the long staple variety. The Gezira scheme, which developed a large portion of the south to relative wealth, has proved itself a model of agricultural achievement which other undeveloped areas conceivably could adopt. Extensive irrigation could increase the chances for an even more diversified economy. Liberal foreign trade policies have aided in stimulating Sudan's exports and imports. Its world trade balance is satisfactory and foreign exchange reserves have steadily grown to over $150 million. Annual capital formation is at approximately 10 percent and development investments are growing at a rate of more than 8 percent of the gross national product, which has been estimated at $900 million.

Internal problems have not prevented the Sudan from taking an active part in international affairs, as its membership in the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa has demonstrated; in addition, the Sudan is an important member in such organizations as the League of Arab States, the Organization of African Unity, and the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Though the Sudan has been experiencing what one might call growing pains there is little doubt as to the resolution and determination of this large and friendly country to meet the challenges and overcome the difficulties which beset it.

I am certain that the entire American people join me in extending warm and sincere congratulations on this, the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of the Sudan.

Can We Tolerate Nonconformity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting essay by Miss Bridgid Regan, age 17, a political science student at Alverno Heights Academy, Pasadena, Calif. Miss Regan is the granddaughter of Mr. and Mrs. Phil Regan of Pasadena and Palm Springs, Calif.

CAN WE TOLERATE NONCONFORMITY?

(By Bridgid Regan)

Can the health of a society be determined by its toleration of nonconformity? To answer this question one must first decide what is nonconformity. That man is an individual, original and different from his neighbor, is an accepted fact. For each man has aims and desires belonging to him only. The real question lies in how far can this nonconformity extend. Can society as we know it exist without a certain amount of conformity? I think not.

In our society it seems to be the trend to be radically different: to challenge authority, national policies, and seemingly all standards of society; to be a nonconformist, blindly disagreeing with all social groups. Yet I believe the nonconformist falls into either of two distinct types. One absolutely is essential to the health of any society while the other weakens and disrupts any semblance of organization.

The first is the true individual. He believes that man should think for himself, have original and creative ideas. Yet he also knows that he must conform to certain rules of society or man living in community cannot exist. Using reason and conscience, he determines his degree of conformity. He remains true to his ideals in morals and other areas where compromise would prove fatal.

The second type comprises those who disagree with everything, thinking it is a mark of extreme intelligence. In reality their inability to conform can be attributed to immaturity and insecurity. These nonconformists are the marchers demonstrating against the war in Vietnam. They fail to realize that the mature, intelligent person accepts his responsibilities and stands behind his Government. The students rioting in Berkeley last year are another example of this type. They fail to conform to authority. These nonconformists may be considered in a sense to be "rebels without a cause."

A healthy nation tolerates nonconformity to the extent of allowing each man to be an individual in thoughts and ambitions. The basic tenets of democracy, freedom of religion, speech and press, are based on nonconformity. Our Nation is founded upon individualism. However at the same time we must conform to certain rules of society. Our rights are relative. An example of our conformity is that we are the United States of America not 50 independent countries. We must accept our responsibilities as citizens of America, for a healthy nation both conforms and nonconforms, each in the right proportion.

Statement of Col. D. George Paston Before the Cabinet Committee on Federal Retirement Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the question of proper retirement pay for members of the Military Establishment, so important to the Congress, was ably discused by Col. D. George Paston, of New York, before the Cabinet Committte on Federal Retirement Systems. It is my pleasure to submit to the Congress the study made by Colonel Paston which should prove very useful in devising and promulgation of appropriate legislation covering such retirement pay:

STATEMENT OF COL. D. GEORGE PASTON BEFORE THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL RETIREMENT SYSTEMS, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 14, 1965

Mr. Chairman, and the other distinguished members of this summit committee, I am the judge advocate of Empire Chapter (New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut) and national executive committeeman of the Disabled Officers Association (organized in 1919), and chairman of the committee on military justice of the New York County Lawyers Association (the largest local bar association in the Nation). My address is 55 Liberty Street, New York City. I am accompanied by Capt. Paul F. Shaughnessy of 186 Main Street, Marlboro, Mass., who is the past national commander and a member of the national executive committee of the Disabled Officers Association, and the past commandr of its Massachusetts chapter. He is also a past president of the Middlesex County Bar Association of Massachusetts.

It is our privilege and honor to accept your kind of invitation to appear here and endeavor to assist you in solving the problem which you posed to us, to wit: How the uniformed retirement system can be made more responsive (1) to the needs of management (2) as well as to the needs of individual retirees.

We recommend reenacting the traditional law that retirement pay of those retired for disability shall be 75 percent of current active duty base pay based on grade and length of service.

From 1858 to 1958 (except from 1922 to 1926) whenever active duty pay was altered, the retirement pay was computed to conform. Congress strayed from traditional retirement pay computation in 1922 and restored it in 1926 (Public Law 204, 69th Cong.). The Senate, in its report (S. 364, 69th Cong.), said that the 1922 legislation: "deprives all officers retired prior to that date of said benefits, thereby violating the basic law under which these officers gained their retirement rights. There is no justice in two pay schedules for equal merit and equal service." The 1958 Career Compensation Act abandoned this equitable principle.

Those retired prior to 1958 for permanent injury or disability sustained in line of duty are paid 75 percent of the active duty base pay of their grade and length of service.

Those retired under the 1958 Career Compensation Act may elect to receive either (a) their base pay multiplied by the percentage of disability, not to exceed 75 percent of their base pay, or (b) 2½ percent of base pay multiplied by the number of years of active service. The 1963 Pay Act provided for increases in retirement pay based on future cost of living increases as determined by the Consumers Price Index. In other words, Captain A, retired 1 day before April 1, 1963, would be paid considerably less than Captain B, retired 1 day after that date, even though Captain A was a World War II casualty, and Captain B served only in peacetime. This resulted from the pernicious provision that retirement pay shall be based on the active duty pay on the date of retirement which happened to be less before April 1, 1963, and more thereafter.

The 1963 pay law provides future percentage increases equivalent to rises in cost of living as determined by the Consumer's Price Index. It sounds popular but is basically unsound. It erroneously assumes that the retirement pay of those retired before April 1, 1963, was equivalent to the cost of living. It also ignored the fact that less than $3,000 annual pay is in the poverty category declared by the President. If the Consumers Price Index indicates a 3-percent rise in the cost of living, and we add $75 to a man's $2,500 annual pay, he is still not being paid a cost-of-living pay.

Reasons for our recommendation:

Such traditional law, if reenacted—

1. Would be more responsive to the needs of management in the procurement and retention of personnel, and would reduce considerably the delay and tremendous cost of training new personnel. Simple basic training costs the Government $4,000 per man. The cost of training a B–52 commander is $1.24 million. Approximately 80 percent quit the armed services at the end of their obligated terms. The cost of training 80 percent of a million-man army replacement exceeds $3 billion.

2. Would be more responsive to the needs of individual retirees, since those who were retired "yesterday" need as much retirement pay as those who are retired "today." Today's cost of living is the same for a man whether he was retired before or after April 1, 1963. The 1963 pay law which gives less retirement pay to those who were retired prior to April 1, 1963, and more retirement pay to those who were retired after that arbitrary date, is obviously fallacious, unreasonable, inequitable, senseless.

3. Would render unnecessary recurring legislation to recompute or adjust retirement pay. By tying in retirement pay with current active duty pay, retirement pay would automatically adjust itself whenever Congress should adjust active duty pay to meet changes in cost of living, Federal civilian pay, or civilian industry pay.

I. SEPARATE RETIREMENT SYSTEM FOR THE DISABLED?

Congress, in its wisdom, may decide on a separate retirement system for those in the uniformed forces who are retired for disability incurred in line of duty, or it may evolve a retirement system for all uniformed personnel and civilian employees.

We speak only for the military who are retired on medical findings that they sustained in line of duty a permanent injury or disability which prevents performance of full field duty.

Since your problem encompasses a wider scope, we will also indicate how the competing civilian industry pension systems have been growing and continue to grow by leaps and bounds, with Government tax exemption encouragement as a key element in the recruitment of personnel, to encourage their continuation in service during their productive years, and to foster a vital work force conducive to the efficiency and success of their respective businesses.

When their obligated terms of service come to an end, 80 percent of those in the uniformed services refuse to continue in service. Like civilian industry, we must have a good retirement system to encourage these trained men, who are vital to the efficiency and success of the armed services, to continue in such service.

Civilian industry has found that "A boy today is more interested in his future than his present," as we will show, and Congressman RIVERS has said that he knows of "no single benefit or privilege accruing to military personnel that contributes more to career attractiveness than the military retirement system." It follows that unless we revert soon to the traditional retirement pay law, we will have only ourselves to blame for the failure of the present unattractive military retirement law, to attract and hold adequate trained personnel.

II. PENSIONS

(Vol. 12, World-Scope Encyclopedia.) A pension is an allowance of money paid to a person who previously rendered services, or to the widow and children of a deceased person. Pensions are paid as periodical allowances as rewards for service rendered in a civil or military capacity. In a number of countries they are granted to persons who have served the government in the time of peace for a specified length of time, whether in a military or civil capacity. In such cases the pension is not based on injury or disability, but wholly upon valued services covering a long period of time. There is an additional provision for the payment of pensions in case of injury or disability.

In the United States pensions are paid upon injury or disability, but Congress has in many cases made special provision for persons who were left in indigent circumstances after having served their country devotedly for a long time. In addition, pensions (more commonly known as "retirement pay") are granted to many categories of civil and military personnel after specified periods of service.

The pension system in the United States dates from a resolution adopted by the Continental Congress, August 26, 1776, promising pensions to soldiers and seamen who might be disabled in the Revolutionary War. By the law of 1789, the Federal Government assumed the obligation of paying war pensions granted by the States. In 1828 an act was passed granting all survivors of the Revolutionary War service pensions. In 1862 existing legislation was written into the general pension law which, with amendments, is still in effect. Subsequent congressional enactments have provided pensions for disabled veterans of all succeeding wars in which the United States has been involved. In many cases pensions have been provided for uninjured veterans of advanced age and for their dependents or survivors.

In 1890 a dependent pension law was passed. By its provisions all persons who served at least 90 days in the naval or military service of the United States in the Civil War, and who were honorably discharged, were entitled to pensions in case of suffering from any permanent disease or disability not caused by vicious habits, whether or not such injury or disability is the result of disease or injury contracted while in the service.

This law was subsequently revised, and the present scale of benefits distinguishes between war and peace disabilities.

In lieu of pension or compensation, Reserve officers called to active duty and officers appointed in the Army of the United States, meeting the requirement of the Army regulations pertaining to the retirement of officers of the Regular Establishment, are retired and their retirement pay is equal to 75 percent of their base pay.

III. CIVILIAN INDUSTRY PENSION SYSTEMS

1. Private industry employees receive some additions to salary which Federal civilians and personnel in the uniformed services do not receive, e.g., savings and benefit plans, year-end and other special bonuses, time-and-a-half pay for work after the regular 8-hour daily stint, and double pay for work on holidays, living with their families in the same place for years without interrupting the schooling of their children, are not forced to sell their homes, the right to change jobs, and profit sharing.

2. The private pension systems, in effect since 1875, have been growing at a terrific rate since World War II. In 1950, 10 million people were covered by company pension plans and 450,000 were drawing the benefits. Since then, the number of employees covered has increased to 25 million which is 40 percent of private industry's work force, and 2.3 million retired workers are drawing about $2.4 billion a year in pension benefits. The average pension increased 25 percent in that period.

The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 (NLRA or Wagner Act), which did not mention employee benefit plans, did specifically refer to "wages" and "other conditions of employment." It gave employees the right to organize and bargain collectively, and made unfair labor practices employer interference with, restraint and coercion of employees in the exercise of their rights. The specific extension of the terms "wages" and "conditions of employment" to employee benefit plans—already in existence or to be established—came in rulings of the Labor Relations Board and court decisions affirming such rulings. The Inland Steel case was the first, perhaps the most famous, litigation of an employer's responsibility to bargain on employee benefit plans. Early in 1947, the NLRB ruled that pension benefits fall within the meaning of "wages," and the other pension plan provisions come under "conditions of employment." It upheld the union's right to bargain over Inland Steel's established pension plan, which previously had not been a subject of negotiations. The applicable rulings and judicial decisions are: Inland Steel Co., 77 NLRB 1 (1948); *Inland Steel Co. v. NLRB*, 170 F. 2d 247 (1948); and *Inland Steel Co. v. NLRB*, 336 U.S. 960, 69 S. Ct. 887 (1949). The employer's objectives in a retirement plan include a desire to retain valuable, trained and experienced employees, to reduce labor turnover and its attendant costs, and to reward long service.

The representative of all the insurance companies testified that the interest of the employer in pensions for his employees stems from the fact that a pension plan affects importantly the welfare of a business or corporate enterprise; it is advantageous to an employer in attracting the right kind of employee, in stimulating such employee's contribution to the enterprise, in encouraging his continuation in service during his productive years, in providing opportunities for advancement for younger people by making provision for the replacement of older employees at retirement age, and in general in fostering a vital work force conductive to the efficiency and success of the enterprise. From the employer's vantage point, pensions constitute a key element in employee relations and employee compensation. These plans ease the anxieties of individual workers as to their future security. In periods of intense competitition for skilled workers a sound pension plan is essential to attract and retain a competent work force.

IV. PENSIONS OF ATHLETES

Uniformed personnel retired for disability sustained in line of duty receive far less retirement pay than those engaged in sports instead of in defense of our country.

Government statistics show that of every 100 who reach age 65 in the United States, 84 are broke, 8 are close to it, 6 are comfortable, and 2 are well off. We won't be surprised if within the next 30 years, those last two are professional athletes. At 65, Stan Musial will be receiving at least $723.25 a month from baseball's pension plan; if Bill George, of the Chicago Bears, stays in one piece for 2 years, he will receive at least $821 a month when he's 65. And if Gordie Howe continues terrorizing National Hockey League goalies for the remainder of this season and all of the next, he will qualify for $1,640 per month at the age 65. And that doesn't include social security benefits. A 5-year veteran in the National Football League already is assured of a higher income at 65 than a 5-year executive at General Motors. To qualify for a GM pension, an employee must have worked for the firm at least 10 years. Consider a typical executive at General Motors. He starts to work at age 29 and eventually works his way into a position paying $20,000 a year. After 35 years of employment, he retires at 65 with $729.29 monthly pension. Not bad. Now consider the pro football player who also works in the off season for GM and then continues after his playing days are over. If he plays 5 years in the NFL and serves GM for 35 years at a salary of around $12,000 he will receive three pension checks at age 65, including social security, which total $1,162 a month, or $13,944 a year. Pension plans in sports are phenomena of our times. In the 1920's, 1930's, and 1940's, a majority of the athletes faced the future with nothing more than a handful of newspaper clippings. Everybody knows how many loaves of bread a newspaper clipping will buy. Of the six sport organizations which are considered major league, only the youthful American Football League is without a retirement plan, and an AFL spokesman has reported that the league will have one operating this year. "There's no doubt that the NFL pension plan hurts us in recruiting the new players," he said. "A boy today is more interested in his future than his present. Joe Namath's contract provided for a fantastic retirement program, and he demanded that in his negotiations with the Jets." These lucrative pension plans didn't just grow from the kindness of owners' hearts. There have been negotiations, disputes, and, in one case, a law suit.

V. MEN IN THEIR MIDDLE TWENTIES ARE CONCERNED ABOUT THEIR OLD AGE

"In my conversations with lawyers who go to the law schools to hire young men to come into their firms, they find that men in their middle twenties are concerned about their old age. We find an increasing tendency on the part of these young men to go to corporations that offer benefits such as retirement plans, profit sharing, pensions, and so forth, rather than go out into the active practice of law, into the forum, where only opportunity exists, but with none of the benefits." (Testimony of William F. Dickson, Esq., attorney at law, Norfolk, Va., chairman, Special Committee on Retirement Benefits Legislation, American Bar Association, accompanied by Donald E. Channell, director, Washington office, American Bar Association, and Charles M. Nisen, attorney at law, Chicago, Ill., p. 60, hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Special Committee on Aging, U.S. Senate, 89th Cong., 1st sess., March 4, 1965.)

As the demand for inside law services climbs, more and more corporations are seeking new talent through active law school recruiting programs.

"With industry interviewing here now along with law firms and government agencies, the competition for students is getting to be fantastic—it's like fraternity rushing," says William Hill, assistant dean and director of placement at the University of California School of Law at Berkeley. Indiana University Law School, the 10th largest in the country, reports on-campus interviews by corporations have doubled since 1963. Even at Harvard Law School, traditionally a training ground for large law firms, the number of companies recruiting students has climbed 60 percent in the last 5 years.

Until a few years ago, law students weren't interviewed by prospective employers until fall or spring of their third year. But today's high-pressure competition is forcing corporations, as well as law firms, to woo second-year students. The companies offer well paying summer jobs and a chance to gain practical experience in corporate law.

Permanent job offers go to the most promising students at the close of the summer or during fall recruiting periods.

Despite the recent tremendous growth of inside law departments, it's still an uphill battle to interest the cream-of-the-law-school crop in corporate practice, complains Daniel C. Smith, general counsel of Weyerhaeuser Corp. "There's a lot of romance to the big Wall Street firm. We're still suffering from the image of 30 years ago when house counsels were merely conduits that channeled the important and interesting legal problems to outside law firms."

Weyerhaeuser, a forest products company, tells law students that they will receive more responsibility at an earlier age as corporate lawyers than will their contemporaries in private practice. "We don't have to worry about impressing a client with an older, more experienced man if a younger guy can do the job," says Mr. Smith.

However, most young lawyers realize that as house counsel they can't look forward to the eventual $50,000-plus annual incomes of their contemporaries who become partners or senior members of Wall Street law firms. A 1964 U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics survey lists $23,700 as the average annual salary of the more experienced house counsel. Excluded from the average were the higher salaries of heads of law departments, who often are company officers as well.

Corporate attorneys counter such income comparisons by pointing to fringe benefits such as pension plans and health insurance, which are generally unavailable to private practitioners. In addition, they say, law departments are proven training grounds for the upper levels of company management. Roger M. Blough, chairman of United States Steel Corp., is a former house counsel, as is Robert H. Gerdes, president of Pacific Gas & Electric Co., one of the Nation's largest utilities. Recently, Chas. Pfizer & Co. elected its former general counsel, John J. Powers, president and chief executive officer. Mr. Powers joined his company's law department in 1941.

VI. SOCIAL SECURITY

1. At the foundation of all industrial retirement programs is, of course, our social security system, the greatest insurance system in the world.

2. Also basic is the fact that social security benefits, climbing steadily since the 1930's, are still rising.

3. But social security is just the foundation of an individual's financial independence in retirement, not the whole—and it was never meant to be the whole thing. As private pension programs have boomed and company benefits have been steeply increased, the gap between the circumstances of the hundreds of thousands who retired in past years and who are now retiring has widened perceptibly.

4. This gap is what highlights the importance of efforts by corporations on their own to upgrade the pension status of already retired employees.

VII. PAST RETIREMENT PAY IS VOLUNTARILY INCREASED BY CIVILIAN INDUSTRY EMPLOYERS

In 1963 General Electric granted a 15 percent across-the-board hike to employees to whom it owed nothing. They were 25,000 ex-employees who had already retired under pension contracts geared to the formulas and salaries of past years. Since 1960, GE's "raises" amounted to 45 percent for all workers who retired on or before September 1, 1946—at a cost to GE of $20 million during this period alone. In addition, medical and hospitalization insurance coverage was more than doubled for retired employees. In increasing numbers, private industry is remembering its "forgotten" employees who retired a decade or more ago, when salary and cost of living levels were far below today's averages. What GE is doing is a dramatic illustration of this practice, but it is only one illustration.

Testifying before the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes of the Special Committee on Aging, Mr. H. L. Severance, secretary of Standard Oil Company of California, said: "As to those of our more than 3,000 annuitants who left some years ago, the company makes an out-of-the-till payment to bring their retirement income up to a more reasonable relationship to current retirements." His company's annuity plan has been in effect since 1903. Its supplementary plan to protect its employees against inflation and the deteriorating purchasing power of the money coming from its annuity plan was inaugurated in 1952. Other leaders in efforts to revise formulas of retired workers to meet current conditions include American Telephone, United States Steel, Bankers Trust, RCA, Detroit Edison, and Columbia Gas.

Periodic reviews of past pension contracts to adjust them to today's realities come voluntarily from private industry. It's costly, but the overall return to a company may dwarf the actual money outlay. The importance of community goodwill cannot be shrugged off—retired workers have a rising voice and vote. Nor can the appeal to employees a corporation wants to hire and to employees it wants to hold be shrugged off. Just the simple fact that our population is aging so rapidly warns us that the number of retired individuals will soar in coming years and the push toward earlier retirement both by corporations and unions will lift the figures even higher. Equalization of a retired worker's benefits is a social welfare trend which will broaden and take on new dimensions in our society.

VIII. GEORGE WASHINGTON AND THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

(Vol. III, "History of the United States of America," by J. A. Spencer, entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1874 in the office of the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D.C.)

In a council of the officers, a great variety of opinions was expressed as to the most eligible place for winter quarters for the Army. Washington, compelled to decide the question himself, fixed upon Valley Forge, a deep and rugged valley, about 20 miles from Philadelphia, bounded on one side by the Schuylkill and on the other by ridges of hills.

The Legislature of Pennsylvania, vexed at the loss of Philadelphia, found it in their hearts to complain of Washington going into winter quarters. This drew from him some pretty plain words on this point: "We find, gentlemen, without knowing whether the Army was really going into winter quarters or not, reprobating the measure as much as if they thought that the soldiers were made of stocks or stones, and equally insensible of frost and snow; and moreover, as if they conceived it easily practicable for an inferior army, under the disadvantages I have described ours to be, which are by no means exaggerated, to confine a superior one, in all respects well appointed, and provided for a winter's campaign, within the city of Philadelphia, and to cover from depradation and waste, the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey. * * * I can assure these gentlemen that it is a much easier and less distressing thing, to draw remonstrances in a comfortable room, by a good fireside, than to occupy a cold, bleak hill, and sleep under frost and snow, without clothes or blankets. However, although they seem to have little feeling for the naked and distressed soldiers, I feel superabundantly for them, and from my soul I pity those miseries, which it is neither in my power to relieve nor prevent."

The soldiers were too miserably deficient in suitable clothing to be exposed to the inclement winter under tents merely, it was therefore determined that a sufficient number of huts should be erected, to be made of logs, and filled in with mortar, in which they would find a more effectual shelter. The whole army began its march toward Valley Forge in the middle of December; some of the soldiers were seen to drop dead with cold; others, without shoes, had their feet cut by the ice; and left their tracks in blood. After the most painful efforts, the troops at length reached their destined quarters. They immediately set about constructing their habitations upon a regular plan. In a short time, the barracks were completed, and the soldiers lodged with some slight degree of comfort.

It is impossible, however, to express in words, the intense suffering which the army was called upon to endure at Valley Forge. Utterly destitute of almost everything necessary to support life; tattered and half naked; some few of the soldiers had one shirt; many only the moiety of one; and the greater part, none at all. Numbers of these brave men, for want of shoes, were compelled to go barefoot over the frozen ground. Few, if any, had blankets for the night. Great numbers sickened; others, unfitted for service by the cold and their nakedness, were excused by their officers from all military duty, and either remained in their barracks, or were lodged in the houses of the neighboring farmers; and nearly 3,000 men were thus rendered incapable of bearing arms. Sadly in want of even straw, to render their huts fitted, in this slight degree, for the occupancy of human beings, the soldiers, overwhelmed with lassitude, enfeebled by hunger, and benumbed with cold, in their service by day and by night, had no other bed in their huts except the bare and humid ground. This cause, joined to the others that have been related, propagated diseases. The hospitals were as rapidly replenished as death evacuated them, and their administration was no less defective in its organization than that of the camp. The unsuitableness of the buildings in which they had been established, the excessive penury of every kind of furniture, and the multitude of sick that crowded them, speedily produced its natural result. The hospital fever broke out in them, and daily swept off the vigorous and more active, as well as the feeble and worndown defender of his native land.

It was not possible to remedy this sad state of things, by needful changes of linen, for they were utterly unprovided in this respect; nor by a more salubrious diet, when the coarsest was scarcely attainable; nor even by medicines, which were either absolutely wanting, or of the worst quality, and adulterated through the shameless cupidity of the contractors: for such, in general, as has been justly said, has been the nature of these furnishers of armies, that they should rather be denominated the artisans of scarcity; they have always preferred money to the life of the soldier. Hence it was, that the American hospital resembled more a receptacle for the dying than a refuge for the sick: far from restoring health to the diseased, it more often proved mortal to the well. This pestilential den was the terror of the army. The soldiers preferred perishing with cold in the open air, to being buried alive in the midst of the dead. Whether it was the effect of inevitable necessity, or of the avarice of men, it is but too certain, that an untimely death carried off many a brave soldier, who, with better attentions, might have been preserved for the defense of his country in its distress.

Certainly nothing could be imagined to equal the sufferings which the American Army had to undergo in the course of this winter, except the almost superhuman firmness with which they bore them. A small number, it is true, seduced by the royalists, deserted their colors, and slunk off to the British Army in Philadelphia; but these were, for the most part, Europeans, who had entered the continental service. The true-born Americans, supported by their patriotism, and by their profound veneration and love for Washington, displayed invincible perseverance; they chose rather to suffer all the extremes of famine, and of frost, than to violate, in this dark hour of peril, the faith they had pledged to their country. Had Howe possessed enterprise enough to attack the patriot army at this time, disastrous must have been the consequences. Without military stores, and without provisions, how could the Americans have defended their entrenchments? Besides, to enter the field anew, in the midst of so rigorous a season, was become for them an absolute impossibility. On the 1st of February 1778, 4,000 of the troops were incapable of any kind of service, for want of clothing. The condition of the rest was very little better. In a word, out of the 11,000 or 12,000 men that were in camp, it would have been difficult to muster 5,000 fit for duty.

One cannot fail to have been surprised, that the Army should have been deficient in supplies of food, in a country abounding with provisions. A few words of explanation seem to be needed, to account for such a fact. Early in the war, the office of commissary-general had been conferred on Colonel Trumbull, of Connecticut, a gentleman well fitted for that important station. Yet, from the difficulty of arranging so complicated a department, complaints were repeatedly made of the insufficiency of supplies. The subject was taken up by Congress; but the remedy administered, served only to increase the disease. The system was not completed till near midsummer; and then its arrangements were such, that Colonel Trumbull refused the office assigned to him. The new plan contemplated a number of subordinate officers, all to be appointed by Congress, and neither accountable to, or removable by, the head of the department. This arrangement, which was made in direct opposition to the opinion of the commander in chief, drove Colonel Trumbull from the Army. Congress, however, persisted in the system; and its effects were not long in unfolding themselves. In every military division of the continent, loud complaints were made of the deficiency of supplies. The armies were greatly embarrassed, and their movements suspended, by the want of provisions. The present total failure of all supply was preceded by issuing meat unfit to be eaten. Representations on this subject had been made to the commander in chief, and communicated to Congress. That body had authorized him to seize provisions for the use of his army within 70 miles of headquarters, and to pay for them in money or in certificates. The odium of this measure was increased by the failure of the Government to provide funds to take up these certificates when presented. At the same time, the provisions carried into Philadelphia, were paid for in specie at a fair price. The temptation was too great to be resisted. Such was the dexterity employed by the inhabitants in eluding the laws that notwithstanding the vigilance of the troops stationed on the lines, they often succeeded in concealing their provisions from those authorized to impress for the Army, and in conveying them to Philadelphia. Washington, urged on by Congress, issued a proclamation, requiring all the farmers within 70 miles of Valley Forge, to thresh out one half of their grain by the 1st of February, and the rest by the 1st of March, under the penalty of having the whole seized as straw. Many farmers refused, defended their grain and cattle with muskets and rifle, and in some instances burnt what they could not defend.

It may well be believed, that Washington was filled with anguish at the calamities of the Army. But nothing gave him more pain, than to see his soldiers exposed to the most injurious example; the officers openly declared their design of resigning their commissions; and many of them had already left the Army, and returned to their families. This determination was principally owing to the depreciation of paper money: it was become so considerable, and the price of all articles of consumption, as well for this reason as from the difficulties of commerce, was so prodigiously advanced, that the officers, far from being able to live as it became their rank, had not even the means of providing for their subsistence. Some had already exhausted their private resources; others had become deeply involved in debt; and it was evident that, unless some steps were taken to prevent it, the Army would ere long be deprived of nearly all its best and most efficient officers.

Washington spared no exertions to remedy this evil; besides holding out every encouragement in his power to his officers, he besought Congress to take some steps to meet the emergency. With great force and clearness, he urged upon Congress to secure half pay to the officers after the war, either for life, or for a definite term. Disclaiming absolutely any personal interest in the settlement of this question, he observed, that it was easy to talk of patriotism, and to cite a few examples from ancient history, of great enterprises carried by this alone to a successful conclusion; but that they who relied solely upon individual sacrifices for the support of a long and bloody war, must not expect to enjoy their illusion long; that it was necessary to take the passions of men as they are, and not as it might be wished to find them; that the love of country had indeed operated great things in the commencement of the present revolution; but that to continue and complete it, required also the incentive of interest and the hope of reward.

Congress manifested, at first, very little inclination to adopt the propositions of the Commander in Chief, either because they deemed them too extraordinary, or from reluctance to load the state with so heavy a burden, or, finally, because they thought the grants of lands to the officers and soldiers ought to satisfy the wishes of men possessed of any moderation. But at length, in the spring of 1778, submitting to what seemed to be a necessity, they decreed an allowance of half pay for life to the officers of the Army, with the reservation, however, to the Government, of the power to commute it, if deemed expedient, for the sum of 6 years' half pay. A short time after, this resolution was reconsidered, and another passed, which restricted the allowance of half pay to 7 years, dating from the end of the war. These measures, though salutary, were not taken till too late, and, moreover, were not sufficiently spontaneous on the part of the Government. Already more than 200 officers of real merit had given up their commissions; and it was again exemplified on this occasion, that a benefit long delayed, and reluctantly conferred, loses a large part of its value in the eyes of those whom it is intended to serve.

IX. RETIREMENT PAY OF FEDERAL JUDGES

A Federal judge, we have been informed, may retire at age 70 after 10 years' service or at age 65 after 15 years' service, on 100 percent active duty pay.

A retired officer of the uniformed services, other than those retired for permanent disability incurred in line of duty, must serve at least 20 years on active duty, and his retirement pay may never exceed 75 percent of his basic active duty pay. Such 75-percent figure is misleading and is actually far less, since it is only a percentage of basic pay and does not include the extra pay for subsistence, quarters, and hazardous duty which is paid to those on active duty in addition to basic pay.

A retired officer may be ordered to active duty without his consent (sec. 675, title 10, United States Code).

A retired officer is subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 802, art. 2, title 10, U.S.C.)

X. INCENTIVES TO INDUSTRY

Incentive, as an adjective, is defined by the dictionary as "having power to arouse, encourage, or stimulate." As a noun, it is defined as "that which moves the mind or operates on the passions; that which incites or has a tendency to incite determination or action; spur—as the love of money and the desire of promotion are two most powerful incentives to action."

We have shown that civilian employers compete with each other and with the Federal Government in offering better retirement pay as incentives to obtain and retain skilled employees.

Our Government now finds that, by offering incentives to its contractors, it increases efficiency, speeds production, and saves money.

Defense Secretary McNamara is doing away with cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts. He is substituting an incentive contract which provides bonuses for speed and efficiency in performance of a contract and penalties for failure to meet the terms set by the Defense Department.

Last October, 16 days before it was due, a new twin-engine jet fighter built for the Air Force and Navy rolled out of General Dynamics Corp.'s mile-long plant at Fort Worth, Tex. Called the F–111, the plane was in the air December 21, 10 days early for its first test flight. By January 6, a full 24 days ahead of schedule, test pilots demonstrated the craft's unique variable-sweep wing in flight. Such speed in developing the first F–111 and 22 sister aircraft on a $480 million contract is earning General Dynamics sizable Defense Department bonuses—$875,000 alone for beating the deadline on testing the movable wings in flight. In all, the company is eligible for some $25 million in incentive payments plus a scheduled $39 million profit on the contract.

XI. TO RECRUIT AND RETAIN ADEQUATE, EXPERIENCED AND TRAINED PERSONNEL, THE ACTIVE DUTY PAY AND THE RETIREMENT PAY OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES MUST BE MADE MORE ATTRACTIVE, OR OUTWEIGH, THE INCENTIVES OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Navy Secretary Nitze recently testified before the Rivers congressional committee that personnel "stands out clearly as the most important single ingredient in our posture. This ingredient exerts a predominant, controlling influence upon every aspect of our department endeavors. It governs the efficiency, reliability and effectiveness on weapons and equipments. It determines the readiness of our combat forces. It is the basis for our selective response to worldwide contingency demands, and it provides the driving force toward progress and improvement. These people furnish the ideas, skills, and energies which transform dollars and resources into effective naval forces. The most important problem which confronts me today as Secretary of the Navy involves procurement of personnel and the retention of skilled, experienced military personnel as careerists in the naval service. These intelligent young gentlemen look closely at the long-range prospects for advancement at various stages of a career as a line officer. They are also careful to weigh the advantages of a career as an officer against those offered by alternative civilian occupations in and out of government. It is difficult to convince them that the intangible rewards and satisfactions of faithful service to the country outweigh the tangible incentives of civilian employment. Many segments of industry, for example, more than match the salary, fringe benefit and retirement inducements of a military career without demanding long hours of unpaid overtime, family separations, or personal hazard."

Gen. Wallace H. Greene, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, testified: "All too many of the really talented people are leaving at the end of their periods of obligated service. Large numbers of highly competent young men, both officers and enlisted, who would genuinely like to follow a military career, turn away to civilian enterprise. These people are thinking of their futures. Our surveys indicate that in making this assessment they reluctantly conclude that the military pay scales will not afford them the opportunity to provide properly for their families and to educate their children" (p. 729).

Mr. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, testified: "We cannot compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession but we can and should see to it that he at least shares with the civilian population the rising American standard of living" (p. 450).

Congressman Rivers said: "I know of no single benefit or privilege accruing to military personnel that contributes more to career attractiveness than the military retirement system" (p. 441). In view of this he added that he favors annual recomputation. As pointed out above, if we revert to the traditional law that retirement pay shall be 75 percent of current active duty pay, retirement pay will automatically self-adjust itself and recomputation will be unnecessary.

Testifying before the same congressional committee, Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, said that "The Army has always considered its people to be its most important asset" (p. 1322), and "I believe it equally important to the overall problem of career attractiveness to give proper recognition to retired military personnel" (p. 1323).

Congressman William H. Bates, ranking Republican member of the committee, asked the Army Chief: "Well, now, historically we have always equated retire pay with active duty pay until recently. Do you believe we should revert to that policy?" General Johnson replied: "Yes, sir" (p. 1335).

In connection with the Uniformed Services Pay Act of 1965, H.R. 9075, the June 24, 1965, report of Mr. Rivers included an Actuarial Analysis of the Department of Defense Retirement Adjustment Factors, prepared for the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services by the Wyatt Co., actuaries and employee benefit consultants, beginning on page 73. Among other things they said;

"Military and civilian pay systems are not identical. For military officer personnel, basic pay constitutes only about three-fourths of the total direct compensation (including subsistence, quarters, reenlistment bonus, extra pay for hazardous duty, etc.) other than pension costs. For enlisted personnel, basic pay is about two-thirds of the total. For typical civilian groups, basic pay would usually run between 90 and 100 percent of total direct compensation other than pension costs. * * * The ultimate goal of both the Department of Defense and the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services is to provide the military services with such a balance in base pay, other allowances and pension, as to enable them to compete successfully with private industry for new personnel. The retirement adjustment factors have been analyzed with this ultimate goal in mind. * * * There are inequities inherent in this aggregate process that are hard to justify. * * * The appropriateness of the military compensation levels will continue to be measured by their ability to attract new recruits and retain the best military personnel in service within the framework of any budget limitations on aggregate compensation and any estimated military manpower requirements. * * * An increase in basic pay in the course of an active duty career increases expected retirement benefits because such benefits are tied to highest basic pay. This is equivalent to saying that past retirement accruals for the years spent in the active duty force prior to the pay raise are insufficient to cover the increase in expected retirement benefits resulting from the pay raise."

XII. CONCLUSIONS

1. (a) A boy today is more interested in his future than his present.

(b) While money is not the sole goal, it, nevertheless, facilitates all relations and is important in the choice of a vocation. The individual studies the income probabilities of his interests, as he realizes that he will be happier if he is paid for doing what he is interested in than if he is forced to be interested in what he is paid for. Immediate income in the early years is not a safe guide. Making a decision involves considering not only the income producing power of the vocation at the moment, but also the possibilities for producing income over a long period of years and eventuating in an attractive retirement income.

(c) Civilian industry attracts and retains trained and experienced personnel—

By offering better retirement pay than that offered by competitors and the Government; and

By voluntarily revising the past pension contracts of retired employees to adjust them to today's realities, thereby generating goodwill, a key factor in obtaining and retaining satisfied employees, the value of which dwarfs the monetary cost involved.

2. (a) The service pay and retirement pay of our uniformed services are far below the incentives of civilian industry where an employee draws extra pay for overtime work, may change his jobs at will, is not separated from his family, is paid end-of-year and other bonuses, and is not subjected to combat and other military hazards. As a result, we have never been able to recruit and retain adequate personnel, and must resort to the draft with the waste of valuable time and tremendous cost of training these draftees.

Eighty percent of our uniformed personnel leave the service at the end of their obligated term of service. Any civilian concern would be bankrupt if it had a constant 80 percent personnel turnover.

(b) Granted that a boy today is more interested in his future than his present, and civilian incentives are more alluring than those offered by the uniformed services, we must revise the active duty pay and retirement pay of the uniformed services to match or surpass that of civilian industry.

3. The uniformed retirement system can be made more responsive to the needs of management as well as to the needs of individual retirees, by reenacting the traditional law that retirement pay shall be 75 percent of the current active duty pay for the grade and length of service of the retiree.

4. Aside from the recruitment and retention problem, morality and fairness requires that those retired, whether before or after 1963, shall have their retirement pay based on current active duty pay instead of on the different active duty pay scales prevailing on their different dates of retirement.

Calm, deliberate reason, candor, a dispassionate, and yet a determined resolution to do your duty, will, I am persuaded, be the principles by which you will be guided in the solution of your problems.

I believe we have offered a simple, clear, and effective solution to the particular problem posed. I am willing to answer any questions which you esteemed gentlemen may desire to ask, if I can possibly do so.

Respectfully,

D. George Paston.

General Berg. Regarding those companies you cited, do they adjust retirement pay on a recomputation basis or are they making some other adjustments to retired pay to bring it in line?

Colonel Paston. As to those who retired in previous years on retirement pay geared to formulas and salaries of past years, they revise those formulas of retirement pay geared to today's salaries. We continue to hear arguments that retirement pay should be recomputed. I reemphasize that if we reenact the traditional law that retirement pay shall be 75 percent of current active duty base pay, retirement pay will automatically adjust itself and there will be no need for recurring legislation to recompute retirement pay. Have I answered your question, General Berg?

General Berg. You have, sir; thank you.

George Perrin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, George Perrin, president of Plastics Research & Development Corp., Fort Smith, Ark., is a resident of the district which I am honored to represent. In December he was named to receive the 1966 American Success Story Award, 1 of only 10 businessmen throughout the country to be so named, by the Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc.

Mr. Perrin was cited for one man's ability to build a prestige independent business by seeking out and filling industrial needs. From a modest start, he built Plastics Research & Development Corp. to a 60,000-square-foot plant with completely coordinated facilities for product development, mold building, custom molding, assembly, packaging and distribution serving leading manufacturers and distributors. Divisions of Plastics Research manufacture and distribute home decorative products, toys, military identification and fishing tackle, with worldwide sales employing 200 people. Especially noted are his 124 models of realistic fishing lures.

We are proud to have him in our area. He is doing a wonderful job for the State of Arkansas and for the country as a whole. My heartiest congratulations to George Perrin.

Polar Bear Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, when U.S. servicemen are fighting with their lives to defend freedom, I feel it would strengthen the troubled hearts of Americans to read a resolution adopted by the Polar Bear Association and the Polar Bear Post 436 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Detroit, supporting the President and the Armed Forces in the effort to combat tyranny. Americans will always remember the courageous men of the Polar Bear Association, who were part of the American North Russian Expeditionary Forces in World War I. The resolution, which I am pleased to insert in the Congressional Record, follows:

Joint Resolution Adopted by Polar Bear Association and Polar Bear Post 436, VFW, of Detroit, Mich.

Whereas we the members of Polar Bear Association, a national organization and Polar Bear Post 436 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Detroit, Mich., whose membership are World War I veterans of the American North Russian Expeditionary Forces who served in the arctic region of European north Russia and fought with guns and bayonets in an undeclared war against the Bolsheviki, now commonly known as Communists, under most trying conditions in subzero weather, poorly equipped and poorly rationed, fighting on the side of the anti-Communists in a civil war in which nearly 300 American men died and as many or more wounded and disabled, from a total force of 5,500 who were detached from the 85th Division; and

Whereas our military forces are presently engaged in aiding Vietnam in their fight against the Communist Vietcong; and

Whereas Lyndon B. Johnson, our President and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, also the Congress of the United States have deemed it wise and necessary to support Vietnam with military and financial aid in its struggle against international communism: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the membership of the Polar Bear Association and Polar Bear Post 436, Veterans of Foreign Wars, who were privileged to serve our country in a somewhat similar situation, do hereby declare our full and unqualified support of our President, our Congress, and the Armed Forces of the United States, whenever and wherever they may be serving in the cause of freedom against tyranny and particularly against communism; and further be it

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President and Congress of the United States, also to the Secretary of Defense and to the commanding officers of our military forces in Vietnam, Santo Domingo, and wherever they may be serving in the cause of freedom.

Adopted November 16, 1965.

Henry Mitchell Writes of the Rendezvous in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most stirring events in our Nation's history occurred during adjournment, when two orbiting capsules bearing the flags of the United States rendezvoused in space.

The crews of these two ships are heroes in every sense of the word. As Americans, we all feel a great surge of pride and share their great feeling of accomplishment.

Most of us followed the events on television, and the medium caught the mood of the day perfectly. The brilliant TV critic of the Commercial Appeal in Memphis also caught the great feeling of this event and vividly put his thoughts on paper. Under unanimous consent, I would like to share his column with my colleagues:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Dec. 16, 1965]

Glory Enough for Everyone Rings in Standing Ovation

(By Henry Mitchell)

The room was full of flags. Everybody stood up.

So they said on channel 3, when our four brothers met in the total wilderness of empty space.

Well, what did they expect? Did they expect anybody in that room, that control center, to sit there on his plump rump then?

When all space was full of sweat like our own sweat? When all space was full of learning, more than our own, and full of risk and daring? Full of triumph?

Everybody in the control room stood up. And so did all of us.

Half our astronauts, of course, were dirty and smelled bad. They hadn't shaved or bathed for 11 days. They announced they felt crummy.

Well, that's too bad but it doesn't make all that much difference. Our golden hope hung on their arms. Let 'em smell, let 'em itch. We paid a lot for them and yesterday was their day to pay us back in sapphires.

And when it happened—when we sensed beyond any doubt that we had done something no men have ever done before, when we perceived we opened up what was never opened up before, when we saw our own crummy beards in the sky itself and when we saw our own silly heads with crowns—

Well you're damned right we stood up.

What did anybody think? That you and I are worms or toads?

I can tell you about us. We see glory walk in our house, we see everything we wanted to trust being trustworthy. We see what was risked and given and know it was given for us. And we get up on our feet for it.

Yesterday, it was rather awkward, rather emotional. A whole continent of people with their hearts in their cupped hands. Trust in their big eyes. Pride in their straight legs.

You're right we stood up. And don't ever let me or you or anybody forget what makes a guy stand up.

Wally Schirra, 42, was the special baby of television commentators, who perhaps did not notice how much more they mentioned him than the others.

Because he is what every guy wants to be? Hardly. But because he is what every guy really is. And he reminded everybody of his own common splendor.

And so did they all.

We paid for them. We made them possible. They paid for us. They made us possible.

And there aren't really any words. Yesterday—well words are almost everything, but we didn't need them yesterday.

We are all together in the room. And we see a special kind of honor walk in. And we get up off what we were sitting on.

VISTA Week in Baltimore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, the success of the Peace Corps in establishing a meaningful relationship with the people of other countries has been a significant development of our foreign policy. The creation of a domestic Peace Corps—VISTA—designed to permit Americans to help other Americans has shown the continued unselfishness and desire of Americans to participate in improving our social life.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the proclamation issued by Mayor McKeldin, of Baltimore, designating December 6 through December 11, 1965, as VISTA Week in Baltimore, a proper recognition of the importance of this new program.

PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR THEODORE R. MCKELDIN DESIGNATING THE PERIOD OF DECEMBER 6 THROUGH DECEMBER 11, 1965, AS VISTA WEEK IN BALTIMORE

The war on poverty is the concern of all citizens, and its successful waging can bring new hope to those of our neighbors who suffer from economic and social deprivation.

One of the most effective means of eradicating poverty is through the efforts of individual persons who live and work with the poor, and through example, advice and counsel enable them to help themselves.

The Volunteers in Service to America, often called VISTA volunteers, are fellow citizens who have chosen to devote a year of their lives to the noble cause of helping their fellow man, and these same volunteers are now seeking others to join their ranks.

Now, therefore, I, Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of the city of Baltimore, do hereby proclaim the period of December 6 through December 11, 1965, as "VISTA Week" in Baltimore, and urge all who can do so to cooperate with the VISTA program to the fullest extent possible.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the city of Baltimore to be affixed this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1965.

THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, *Mayor.*

Underground Maps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, all of us were amazed and shocked on the evening of November 9, 1965, when our entire Northeast was blacked out and on the brink of disaster. Many of our Government agencies have been inquiring into the situation, and have been seeking ways and means of preventing a repetition. Unfortunately none of them has been able to assure us that this could not reoccur anywhere in the country—and perhaps even on a far greater scale.

That is why I noted with great interest a recent meeting of officials of the Office of Civil Defense, the District of Columbia, and other interested parties with the top executives of a company called Sanborn Map Co., of Pelham, N.Y. They demonstrated for their audience an entirely new concept in underground maps.

Why do I call attention to underground maps?

As we all know, beneath the surface of our great cities are many miles of cables, sewers, pipes, gas mains, vaults, and other vital facilities. Frequently these underground conduits abut upon or overlap each other. It is obvious, therefore, that repair or maintenance work on any one may set off a chain reaction that could seriously damage others. Certainly urgent repairs necessitated by a major power failure could be seriously hampered.

It is a fact that each utility normally has a map of its own underground facilities. However, frequently it knows little or nothing about contiguous facilities of other agencies. Under the new process created by Sanborn Map Co., all of the various installations are clearly shown on one basic grid. In addition, each of the municipal and private utilities is shown individually with its own overlay. The result is that repair and maintenance crews can operate with greater ease and safety. Precious hours may be saved. Hospitals and manufacturing plants, homes and schools will be functioning far sooner after a power failure.

This is, of course, an important service to assist our municipalities. Nevertheless, I know from experience that it is human nature to put things off, and I fear, therefore, that in the normal course of things it may be many years before all of our municipalities have this protection.

These underground maps and surveys can be of inestimable value in determining breaks and interruptions of power transmission. They could result in the pinpointing of disconnections of lines, cables, belts and transmission conveyances and save vast expenditures.

In cases of fire and flood these maps would be of great value to our municipalities.

I do not venture to state that another power blackout, break, or shortage could be prevented but these maps would materially aid in the work of restoration and report.

Also with these maps cities could reduce the cost of urban renewal projects. They would aid in municipal fire protection and sanitation. They could be helpful in matters of traffic control, subways and tunnel construction, building of highways and bridges and for setting up telegraph and telephone systems.

The uses are legion.

Paralyzed at 9, Dicky Chaput Wins Jaycee Outstanding Young Man Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday in St. Paul, Minn., Richard Raymond Chaput, of Nashua, N.H., will be honored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce as 1 of 10 outstanding young men in America for 1965.

The great dimensions of this achievement become clear when one realizes that Richard Chaput has been paralyzed from the neck down by childhood polio for 21 of his 28 years. For much of his boyhood, his adolescence and now in his young manhood, Richard Chaput has been confined to bed. His nights must be spent in an iron lung.

In his book, "Not To Doubt," Mr. Chaput describes the physical and mental torment through which he passed and how he overcame the blackest depression and despair, with the aid of his native cheerfulness and a rocklike faith in God. He is also the first to recognize the essential love and support received from his family and friends, particularly his parents.

INSPIRATION TO THOUSANDS

Through his book, his articles, and stories, Richard Chaput has touched and inspired countless thousands. The act of writing is immensely difficult for him. Because of his affliction, it is hard for him to speak and he cannot use his hands or arms at all. Dictating letters or other writing is very difficult. Most of his writing is done on an ingenious electric typewriter specially designed so that he can operate it painstakingly with his tongue.

I first met him in person last year when I called on him at the nursing home where he was staying. It was apparent at once that here was a most unusual person. He had accepted his grievous condition philosophically, not without question, but without wasting time in railing and complaining against a situation which was beyond the power of man to change.

NASHUA MAN OF THE YEAR

He was named Man of the Year by the Nashua Junior Chamber of Commerce last year and soon thereafter the process was started to nominate him for the national honors now accorded to him. I was honored to endorse this nomination on his behalf and I now feel honored once more to pay him this tribute in the House of Representatives.

He is a truly outstanding and most inspirational American. I congratulate him on his award and I congratulate the Jaycees on the wisdom of their choice.

Freedom of Speech and the Vietnam Protest Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress begins, the issue which bears heavily on all our thoughts is the grave and complex situation in Vietnam. Many questions come to mind—the conduct of the war, the operations and aid programs of our Nation in the social and economic development of southeast Asia and the direction and role we are to have in underdeveloped regions of the world.

These are problems of how we are to proceed in our relations with other nations. Just as serious is this question: what effect is the war to have on our own national life. The formulation of the budget is one aspect. Another is whether we are going to allow the cold war atmosphere, intensified by Vietnam, to narrow and possibly choke off political debate. It is very easy to label dissent unpatriotic during periods of crisis. To have a national definition of all these issues, however, a vigorous and substantial debate is essential.

An excellent statement on the need for free speech and a climate of critical and unfettered discussion was adopted by the Jewish Community Relations Council on November 7, 1965. This statement is clear and concise and contains a number of important points. I recommend it highly to the attention of my colleagues:

Freedom of Speech and the Vietnam Protest Movement

Americans across the political spectrum are now engaged in vigorous and at times heated debate over our country's role and purpose in southeast Asia. We are convinced that such probing of public issues, however shrill, however irritating and distasteful to those who may disagree, is in the highest and best tradition of our democracy. The American political system depends upon unfettered public discussion to test the wisdom of national policy.

The aims and directions of our country's actions abroad therefore are not merely a legitimate subject for national debate. They constitute an area in which the authentic national interest requires us to provide full opportunity for public speech and for the assertion of diverse points of view.

In the political realm there are no truths so absolute and no judgments so wise that they may be withdrawn from public scrutiny. Especially on such fundamental matters as war and peace, which touch upon the life of every American citizen, it is necessary for our country's position to be subject to the corrective influence of public review and criticism.

One would suppose this principle to be a truism of the democratic process. Nevertheless it appears to have been forgotten or at least temporarily set aside by some of our most influential national leaders of both political parties. The desire of administration spokesmen to mobilize public endorsement for U.S. military intervention in Vietnam unhappily has been accompanied by a corollary desire to discourage criticism and by an apparent willingness to countenance limitations upon free speech and free assembly inconsistent with the tenets of an open society.

We, therefore, believe it imperative publicly to reaffirm that the right of vigorous protest—including demonstrations, parades, rallies, peaceful picketing, and the distribution of literature—is protected by the first amendment; and further that this right of demonstration may not be limited by police on the ground that such behavior might incite others to retaliatory action. We believe that academic freedom requires that members of the teaching community be allowed the liberty outside the classroom to express their personal views on controversial matters without fear of punishment or reprisal. With respect to current protests over U.S. policies in Vietnam, the task of Government authorities and law enforcement agencies is to insure that all those seeking peaceably to express their views, no matter what they may be and no matter how extreme they may seem, are afforded the opportunity to do so without exposure to penalty, interference, or the threat of violence.

Recent actions by various Government officials do not accord with this understanding of the public responsibility. Government figures on all levels have contributed to the evolution of a public mood in which any criticism of American foreign policy in the Far East becomes hazardous. The Attorney General has threatened a full-scale investigation into the demonstrations and has warned that "we may have some prosecutions in this area." The Director of the FBI announced that the Communists are exploiting the protest against the Vietnam war. A Senate Internal Security Subcommittee report charged that the demonstrations had passed into the hands of Communists and extreme elements—an obvious attempt to frighten off participation by Americans of moderate views who may nevertheless be genuinely troubled by our present course in the Far East.

Even more disturbing are threats by various State officials of the selective service program to revoke the deferment of student protesters, to "run down these people as their names appear in the papers" and generally to employ the selective service system as a vehicle for punishing political dissent. These plans have been announced with no word of disapproval from General Hershey, the national head of selective service, that would remind these Government officials they are empowered solely to administer the law and not to harass lawful political activity.

The atmosphere engendered by these pronouncements is best exemplified by the legislation hastily enacted last August to punish those members of the protest movement who have sought to dramatize their opposition by the public burning of draft cards. We do not condone the burning of cards but we do not believe this practice constitutes the kind of clear and present danger to our national security necessary to justify such new and drastic legislation. The fact is that the burning of a draft card in itself has no substantial consequences and in any case was already actionable under statutes requiring those subject to the draft to carry their draft cards on their persons at all times. The burning of the card in no way releases, excuses or immunizes anyone from the operation of the Selective Service Act or from the obligation to serve. It is a minor form of agitation whose sole meaning is symbolic and hortatory. Under these circumstances it is a demonstration of legislative excess that those who destroy draft cards will now be subject to maximum penalties of 5 years imprisonment or $10,000 fine or both. This punishment stands in absurd contrast to the penalty for those guilty of desecrating the U.S. flag, who face no more than 30 days' imprisonment or a $100 fine or both. The dignity of this country—and we believe its ultimate safety—would have been better served if American officials had had the composure to treat draft card buring as a routine infraction subject to such sanctions as were already prescribed under existing law.

This growing intemperance has evoked a menacing climate intolerant of any expression of difference. This is manifest in the contrast in public demeanor at the two parades that recently marched down Fifth Avenue in New York City.

Whatever may be said of the arguments of those who marched in protest over current American policies, their conduct throughout was restrained, orderly, and peaceful. They were, moreover, subject to extreme provocation in the form of vituperative and obscene vocal attacks from the sidewalks and frequently to physical assault from onlookers who repeatedly broke through police lines in order to disrupt the assembly.

On the other hand, although the overwhelming majority of those who marched in the officially sponsored counter-demonstration several weeks later were similarly disciplined and orderly, the fact remains that any one in the vicinity of the march who dared murmur dissent or who carried a placard even remotely disagreeing with the established position was immediately set upon both by demonstrators who left the line of march and by zealous sidewalk patriots all too eager to help. It is noteworthy that none of the personages who sponsored the march or who occupied positions of honor on the reviewing stand found it appropriate to disassociate himself from these acts, to denounce those who perpetrated them or to call for better appreciation and protection of the rights of those who disagreed.

We are mindful of the difficulties posed by the participation of Communists and other extremists in protests against U.S. policies in Vietnam. But they represent only a small minority of the many who are concerned. The protest movement includes thousands of loyal and law-abiding Americans, including members of the U.S. Senate, who have sincere reservations about our Vietnam policies. At the very least therefore we believe it incumbent upon Government authorities to link any pronouncement they make on the Vietnam protest movement with an affirmation of the content and purposes of the first amendment, with the clear pronouncement that lawful protest and dissent are not disloyal, and with the assurance that no punishment or obloquy will be assessed against those persons who exercise their constitutional right to speak their minds.

We are deeply cognizant of the challenges our Government faces in Asia and in other parts of the world. We venture no simple solution to these complex, even agonizing problems. We urge only that great public debate that must ensue be allowed to proceed untrammeled and unafraid.

The Young Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending and participating in the ceremonies in which Burton P. Daugherty, national commandant of the Marine Corps League, presented the first National Young Marines Charter to the Young Marines of the Valley Detachment at Ansonia, Conn.

I want to pay a very special compliment to all of the men and women of the Naugatuck, Conn., Valley who have worked with the commanding officer of the Ansonia detachment, Steve Zuraw, in the formation and development of this youth program.

The Ansonia detachment was initiated in 1962 and it draws its membership from Ansonia, Derby, Shelton, Seymour, Beacon Falls, Oxford, and Southbury. The charter ceremonies attracted nationwide attention focusing on an organized youth group whose purpose is the improvement of health, education, and citizenship of youngsters ranging in age from 8 to 17 years.

The January 1966 edition of the Leatherneck, the magazine of the Marines carried a feature article entitled "The Young Marines" by Sgt. George Broadley, with photos by Cpl. Gary Scarbrough, on the Ansonia detachment.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I include the article here in order that this deserving and developing program may properly be called to the attention of my colleagues:

THE YOUNG MARINES

(By Sgt. George Broadley)

The sounds of boot camp vary little between Parris Island and San Diego. The same gruff voices give the same deep commands, and the same boots scramble to obey the orders.

Older marines with "time in" usually stand by and smile, remembering their own experiences at the hands of D.I.'s. Then, with memories intact, they go about their daily routine.

Now the San Diego or Parris Island atmosphere is present at other boot camps and stations throughout the Nation.

Working under the direction of the Marine Corps League, its members have started a youth group called the Young Marines.

Youngsters ranging from 8 to 17 years old are now wearing the forest green utility uniform. They wear it with as much pride and neatness as do their older counterparts in the regular Marine Corps.

While still too young to serve their country in the armed services, these young men work hard at being better citizens, and possibly future regular marines.

They are learning the meaning of personal pride, integrity, and faithfulness to their fellow man. Also, they have a headstart on other boys their age, for they are learning the meaning and value of discipline.

The Marine Corps League is sponsoring the program and has given the first National Young Marines charter to the Young Marines of the Valley Detachment at Ansonia, Conn.

Steve Zuraw, the energetic commanding officer of the Ansonia detachment, said that the boys get a shock treatment similar to that of a new recruit at either Parris Island or San Diego. They soon get to know the words "Yes, sir," "No, sir," "Double time" and the meaning of military courtesy.

Their boot camp usually lasts for about 20 weeks. The 2½-hour class sessions are held on Friday nights. Upon completion of boot training, the youths are "graduated" into the regular unit.

While the rank structure is the same as the regular Marine Corps, their promotions entail far more than having the required time in grade and passing the current GMST. The League's Young Marines are marked on church attendance, personal cleanliness, post attendance, physical health and school marks. If a Young Marine's school marks fall below average, he is asked to leave the organization.

This seems to have its desired effect because the Young Marines are well above the average in scholastic markings. Teachers credit this fact to the training that the youngsters receive from their D.I.'s, and an avid desire to learn.

The lads also have a physical fitness program in which they are instructed in boxing, simple judo and wrestling. They are also taught craftsmanship, model building, outdoor survival and some military subjects, including drill, inspections, national history, and pride in Corps and county.

Mr. Burton P. Daugherty, National Commandant of the League, presented the Young Marine charter. He said, "there can be no better way for the league to demonstrate its determination to fulfill its purpose than to sponsor a program for American youth designed to preserve and perpetuate our Nation's heritage of a free society."

The Ansonia detachment was started early in 1962, and its serves the cities of Ansonia, Derby, Shelton, Seymour, Beacon Falls, Oxford, and Southbury.

The first formal presentation of the Young Marines, in a parade, took place at the Marine Corps League national convention in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1963.

Due to this particular performance, League members decided to adopt the program and form other units throughout the country.

Units are presently in operation in Connecticut, Florida, California, Missouri, Washington, Louisiana, New York, and Illinois.

"Our Young Marine program is definitely one of the finest and most worthwhile projects the league has even undertaken," said Marine Corps League Commandant Daugherty. "We're giving it everything we've got."

Morris Weinberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, Morris Weinberg will celebrate his 90th birthday. At the same time, he and his gracious wife, Dora, will celebrate their 65th wedding anniversary. It gives me great pleasure to salute these fine people who have contributed so much to the enrichment of American life.

Morris Weinberg is the founder of the Day-Jewish Journal, a paper which has been an important voice in Jewish-American affairs since 1914. But even before that, Morris Weinberg was a dynamic force. Since the turn of the century, he has been a man who has devoted himself to noble causes. His is a name that evokes the warmest feelings of admiration and respect. He has served his people and his country very, very well.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberg are currently enjoying in Palm Beach, Fla., a retirement which they have both earned. I am certain that my colleagues, of whatever faith they may be, join me in extending their salutations and best wishes to Morris and Dora Weinberg. I wish them many, many more years of fruitful and happy life. They are a wonderful example of fine Jews and fine Americans.

The Late Prime Minister Shastri, of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, twice in less than 2 years, India has suffered the loss of its leader.

Each death has been a tragedy and a crisis of major magnitude, not only to India, but to the world.

Each has also marked a turning point and an awakening to reality in this new—yet old—land after centuries of slumber.

The first death was Prime Minister Nehru, the Kashmir aristocrat who led one-sixth of the world's population along the dangerous and difficult path of self-government for 17 years.

The second death was Prime Minister Shastri, the tiny man from near the holy city of Benares, who attempted to weld India into a cohesive whole in the face of crises.

Nehru was a man of strength who believed passionately in peace, a world leader who saw his dreams of a neutral and economically strong India surrounded by peaceful neighbors exploded by Red Chinese attacks on Indian soil.

Shastri was a man of compassion who believed in strength in the face of threats from outside its borders and who turned inward toward domestic problems rather than outward toward the world.

Shastri was also a man of courage, who negotiated a ceasefire with neighboring Pakistan on the day of his death, even though such negotiations were dangerous to him politically.

Prime Minister Shastri's time in office was short. But his accomplishments may well prove to be among the greatest in Indian history.

His efforts to bring peace to Kashmir, to feed the people of India and find the means by which India could defend itself from Red Chinese aggression are deeds which many thought impossible of achievement.

Out of the death of this man so small in physical stature but so large in heart and mind could come peace and stability for India and the subcontinent and a richer life for its people.

Why Should Open Dealing Be Suspect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, every American President since 1954 has offered support to the people of South Vietnam. Over the years, we have made a national pledge to help that country defend its independence.

President Johnson also took up this task. Indeed, he expanded the American involvement by many times believing that to withdraw from one battlefield means only to prepare for the next. We are no longer losing the war in Vietnam—nor, however, are we really winning it. We are at least in a position where we can seek peace terms with honor and without surrendering South Vietnam to the aggressors.

President Johnson has launched an all-out peace offensive to achieve a cessation of the hostilities. He was immediately attacked for his "grandstand play" and his "insincerity." Previously he was severely criticized for his so-called indifference to enemy peace feelers, and now he is being attacked for taking the initiative in this area.

Perhaps this is just an element of our American democracy. Whatever our leaders do, we mistrust their motives and make the most of our freedom to criticize.

A recent editorial by Loudon Wainwright in Life magazine deals with this very subject. I submit this excellent article for the benefit of my colleagues.

The article follows:

WHY SHOULD OPEN DEALING BE SUSPECT?

(By London Wainwright)

It has been interesting during these days of President Johnson's peace offensive to hear the bleats of those who are opposed to it. The President is variously accused of participating in worldwide vaudeville, of practicing amateurish diplomacy, of negating gains we have won in Vietnam, of polishing up his own image as a man of peace before he advises the Congress and the people that we will have to escalate the war.

Certainly Mr. Johnson thrives on theatricality, and he delights in taking devious routes to hidden objectives. Yet I am astonished that more people have not interpreted this dramatic, high-level missionary assault around the globe as evidence that he sincerely seeks an honorable end of the conflict. In fact, I think the skepticism about his methods and his aims not only demeans the man but renders to the enemy a full measure of the same sort of comfort they get from our peace marchers. See, it might well be said in Hanoi, the Americans themselves have little faith in this diplomatic stuntflying; it is a sign of trickery or weakness, and we will have nothing to do with it.

The reason for the skepticism lies, I think, in a national trait we don't boast about or even really believe we possess. If we are cheerful, generous, and courageous, we are also highly suspicious a good bit of the time, especially about a situation where the cards appear to be out on the table. On occasions where there is some room for bargaining, like buying an automobile, most of us, I suspect, go into the deal with the feeling we are going to get clipped and wind up the negotiations sure of it. In the field of diplomacy, Americans have become conditioned to suspect that nothing really worthwhile can be arrived at openly, and that all meaningful activities must take place in secret. We sift a bucket of innuendo for a drop of truth. Like the man in psychoanalysis who is puzzled by his friend's "Hello," we often wonder what is really meant by the simplest things. Used to the notion that big things are brought off in whispers, we doubt the honesty of a loud, clear voice. Of course, the North Vietnamese, Chinese, and Russians all share this characteristic of suspicion, so there is a lot of mutual distrust. But must that rule out bare truth as a tactic of international communication?

There has been a considerable amount of speculation about the factors that might have impelled the President to undertake this personalized, global expression of his and his country's aims toward peace. Some of this speculation holds that Mr. Johnson was driven to this extreme in order to confound and silence the critics of his administration's policies in Vietnam. The peace marchers, the draft card burners, the self-immolators, so this notion goes, have forced the President into a new and unusual stance.

I very much doubt that this is so. There can be no question that the President has been disturbed by the current agitations of one sort and another, and certainly he must have been upset by the allegations that in the recent past the United States had been reluctant to find a peaceful settlement. Surely, too, he has been aware—though his favorite indicators, the polls, do not always clearly show such things—of the fact that the national conscience is troubled by the bloody dilemmas of Vietnam. Yet it seems more reasonable to me to believe that the President is not simply acting in response to these things, but rather that he is testing out direct truthfulness as a possible approach to the practical solution of a terrible problem. Why on earth does that have to be such a poor idea?

For one important thing, there appears to be no evidence that we have been getting any closer to a peaceful settlement through the techniques of a mounting escalation. The enemy simply increases his commitment, and it is decidedly unclear how much escalation it will take to bring Hanoi to what U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, in an interesting reminder that he was once a bigtime labor lawyer, referred to in Rome as "the bargaining table." I suppose that, if we ever reach that place, it will indeed be a bargaining table, with certain clauses tipped into the contract here and there to mollify the various parties. Assuming that our principal goal is peace, assuming also that we do not intend to betray our obligations to the South Vietnamese or to cut and run to achieve that peace, I cannot understand how we minimize our chances for it by saying so to everyone within jet range.

When I heard Pope Paul say in New York, "No more war, war never again," I believed that he thought such an astounding condition was possible. When I hear that a covey of emissaries named HUMPHREY, Harriman, Goldberg, Bundy, and Williams has fanned out all over the world, I find myself believing that the man who sent them means what he says. And from the strident tone of the squawks now coming from Hanoi, I'd guess that some powerful quarters are whispering to them that he means it, too.

Virtually wherever one finds himself in the spectrum of American opinion—unless he is in favor of all-out assault or, on the other hand, total withdrawal from Vietnam—most people, from the peace marchers to the Pentagon, should be able to take some encouragement from the peace offensive. Among other things, it has clarified our aims to a great part of the world. If some remain unconvinced we are at least emphatically on the record. Whatever the results of this offensive are, it seems to me entirely worthy of us.

Which raises, of course, the question of failure. What if the North Vietnamese refuse to take the lull in the bombing or the President's peace talk as an opportunity to move toward a settlement? Do we then—our honest intentions spat upon—fall back on the cruel logic of escalation and an expanded war? Do we, our worst suspicions apparently proved out about the uselessness of straightforward diplomacy, return quickly to the upward spiral of death? On precisely that matter New York Times Columnist James Reston asks a very good question: "What's the rush?" What, indeed? The peace offensive has been a good effort and I believe we should not easily abandon it just because it does not immediately work. The stones grind slow.

"Maggie" Higgins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enclose this editorial from the Muncie (Ind.) Star titled "'Maggie Higgins' in the issue of January 7, 1966.

The article follows:

"MAGGIE" HIGGINS

Fragile, blond Marguerite Higgins wore mud like other women wear makeup while she was covering the Korean war.

But as she told the general who ordered her to leave the combat zone, she wasn't working in Korea as a woman. "I am here," she said, "as a war correspondent."

She was, and a good one, who slogged through the thick of it with the foot-soldiers, wearing slacks, khaki shirt, sneakers, and a fatigue cap.

She was 24 when she had her baptism of fire with the 7th U.S. Army on the Austrian front. She accompanied the liberating forces in their surge across Hitler's dying empire. Her dispatches on the horrors of the concentration camps at Dachau and Buchenwald were detailed, crisp and strong. So, also, were her stories from Korea, which won her a Pulitzer Prize.

She had the superior reporter's habit of refusing to accept the surface picture as the true one. Her sixth and last book, "Our Vietnam Nightmare," boldly traces the intrigues in the upper echelons of the Kennedy administration which led to the overthrow and assassination of President Ugo Dinh Diem and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

"Maggie" traveled light at the front—just carried a toothbrush and towel. But she traveled far. It was a tropical illness picked up during her travels that cost her life. But not before she had made her special contribution to help her country understand the kaleidoscopic events of a violent time.

Where Does Space Fit in a War Budget?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in the Sunday Star of December 19, 1965, is a most thoughtful analysis of the role of our space program in a wartime situation. This editorial clearly identifies the essential features of the NASA effort and its place in meeting our national commitments in the Vietnam struggle.

Where Does Space Fit in a War Budget?

There is more than a little irony in the fact that a cutback in space spending, at least in some degree, is almost certain to follow close on the heels of last week's splendid achievements by our astronauts. Even so, and however incongruous it may seem, the demands of the war in Vietnam are bearing down hard on a beleaguered President.

The outlook in this respect has been somewhat clouded by the peace feeler from Hanoi. If Ho Chi Minh was serious, this overture might have led to a ceasefire and peace negotiations. Any such hope, however, seems to have gone down the drain as a result of premature publicity and the obvious ambiguities in the proposal itself. Hanoi is now saying, untruthfully, that the whole thing was an American "fabrication."

This probably means that the war will go on and that its costs can be expected to rise by billions of dollars. And if we are to avoid budget deficits of very dangerous proportions the Government will have to retrench in the area of the nonessentials or push through a major tax increase.

No easy choices are in sight. A tax boost in an election year, especially after all the self-serving applause which followed the most recent tax reduction, will be a bitter pill for Congress to swallow, particularly for those Members who will be up for reelection. Significant retrenchments can and should be made in some of the Great Society's massive social programs. But this, too, will be politically difficult. The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has already served notice that if the President tries to take this way out of his dilemma "we will have no alternative but to use our lobbying and protest activity to get Congress to reverse it." The President, with his keen ear for the political nuances, will need a great deal of fortitude to stand up to this threat.

So, quite naturally, the budget pruners are taking a hard look at prospective space spending. What NASA projects can be canceled, stretched out, or pushed back? Realistically, what is the outlook for significant economies in this area?

Space spending in this fiscal year, which ends June 30, will be about $5.17 billion. NASA would like an additional $500 million for next year, but probably won't get it. A halt in further work on the Advanced Orbiting Solar Observatory has been announced. A nuclear power unit for the Voyager project, envisioning an unmanned journey to Mars in the 1970's, may be in danger. And other as yet unidentified exploratory undertakings are expected to get the ax.

Development of a nuclear power unit would be expensive. This is not generally true, however, of unmanned space exploration. Consequently the opportunity for economies in these projects, at least in the short run, are not great. For practical purposes this leaves as areas of possible substantial savings, the remaining Gemini flights and the forthcoming tests of Apollo, the spacecraft which has been counted upon to land Americans on the moon by 1969.

The lunar project is the big dollar consumer. Estimates of the eventual cost range from $20 to $30 billion.

The moon program grows out of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, strongly backed by the then majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, and a proposal in 1961 by President Kennedy which looked toward a manned flight to the moon and back by the end of this decade. Among the considerations was the prospect that we might beat the Russians to the moon, and thereby offset some of the prestige they had won through their sputnik flights and the great power of their launching rockets.

Support for a crash program to get to the moon has been considerably less than unanimous. One of the dissenters is Dr. Warren Weaver, a distinguished mathematician and former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In a copyrighted interview earlier this month with U.S. News & World Report, Dr. Weaver said that if we are doing this as some "ridiculous race" against the Russians it is "just plain stupid." The moon, he added, is going to be there, and "I think we are utilizing at the present time altogether too much money," * * * too much of our Nation's technical competence and too much strategic material. Dr. Weaver believes the really important questions which may be answered through a $30 billion moon project could have been sensibly answered at a cost of $500 million over a 5-year period. Presumably, what he had in mind was the landing of instruments, not men, on the moon.

Quite a different view is held by Dr. George E. Mueller, NASA's associate administrator for manned space flight. In an address to the National Conference of Editorial Writers a year ago, he said the principal goal of the manned space program is not to beat the Russians to the moon, but to make the United States first in space. Apparently calculating that the 8-year Apollo program will cost about $20 billion, Dr. Mueller said: "We found that if the remaining 6 years of work were stretched out over 12 years the total cost of the presently approved manned flight program would increase by about 30 percent, or about $6 billion. Thus, the economic considerations support the maintenance of the present well-paced schedule."

What this seems to mean is that a cutback over the next few years, assuming this to be feasible, would increase the final bill by the very large sum of $6 billion. And if an eventual higher cost is thought to be worthwhile for the sake of reduced expenditures in the immediate future, the problems of a stretch-out still remain formidable.

The financial commitments already made for the Apollo program, not to mention the remaining Gemini launchings, cannot be dishonored. The first Saturn rocket, the IB, is ready for its initial test. The Saturn V, expected to produce 7.5 million pounds of thrust, is far advanced. So is work on the vehicles which these powerful rockets can hurl into space. It is difficult to see how this work can be stopped or significantly slowed down without losing more than would be gained from a temporary dollar savings. Then there is the problem of holding together the space team we have so carefully built up, including not only the astronauts themselves, but also the 300,000 highly trained technicians who back them up. To let some or most of them go could have disastrous consequences on our whole future in space.

The very existence of this space-and-the-budget problem rests, of course, on the assumption that we are in for a long war, a war which will make increasing demands on our men and our resources. If the new peace-feeler report should prove to be the real thing, if indeed we get to the conference table before much longer, the President will not have to concern himself unduly with budget cuts in the nonmilitary areas. But Mr. Johnson as of now cannot bank on such a happy issue out of all his afflictions. He must plan to cut spending where he can cut. And while the space program can be trimmed here and there, the really big item in that program—the journey to the moon—does not seem to hold much promise for the pruners.

Which means that the squeeze must be applied elsewhere.

A Supertrain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying legislative achievements of the first session was the high-speed ground transit act. Many hope—and I am one of them—that this program will help railroads regain the popularity and prosperity they once enjoyed in the passenger field.

I am proud that one of the test projects of this program will take place in late 1966 between New Brunswick and Trenton, N.J., because of the area's unique rail facilities and physical qualities.

It was satisfying to read in late 1965 that the Department of Commerce awarded a contract to the Budd Co. for the cars that will conduct the experiments and tests. And service on the Boston-New York-Washington run is expected to start about April 1967, with train speeds ranging to 150 miles per hour. Because of the many merits of New Brunswick and the surrounding area, I hope that this "Hub City" will be one of the stops on the run.

In short, notable progress is being made on this historic and challenging rail program. As one of its several cosponsors and as a resident of Middlesex County, where part of the tests will be held, I submit an editorial by the New Brunswick Daily Home News of December 15, 1965, entitled "Next Year, a Supertrain."

The editorial follows:

Next Year, a Supertrain

You won't be on it but by this time next year you'll see a shiny four-car supertrain whooshing along the Pennsy mainline between here and Trenton at a cool 150 miles per hour. That's 2½ miles per minute, and that's pretty fast.

The Department of Commerce's Northeast Corridor project has awarded the Budd Co. of Philadelphia a near-million-dollar contract for a crash program to get the four new cars on the rails late next year.

The cars are not strictly new. They'll be basically the shiny self-propelled Budd cars that a lucky traveler occasionally finds on the Philadelphia-New York run. A streamlined new design and a souped up powerplant (more than 60 percent more powerful than the existing ones) will raise the train's speed from its present 90 miles per hour to the desired 150 miles per hour.

The project people say this stretch of track between New Brunswick and Trenton has been chosen because it has welded rails which give a smooth ride. It is likely another factor leading to locating the experiment here is the fact that this stretch is virtually curveless.

While this test of high speed rail equipment is being made here with electrically powered units, the project will conduct another experiment on a stretch of nonelectrified track somewhere between Boston and New York on the New Haven Railroad. The power in this second experiment will be gas turbines. Contracts are expected to be let soon for this experiment.

The results of the two tests will be evaluated, and then it is expected that the Department of Commerce will chose the better system and order 50 cars at a cost of some $10 million and put them into service between Boston and Washington.

The benefits which 150 miles per hour speeds will bring to different communities will vary. A key factor will be the choice of stops for the high speed trains. Obviously they can't stop at every station or they will never attain the terminal-to-terminal speed which is the chief reason for establishing the service.

We would hope and expect that New Brunswick would be a regular stop for the high speed trains. Our area is growing rapidly in population. Rutgers will continue to generate more and more passenger potential. Some of our largest industries are headquartered in cities on the Boston-New York-Washington run and their executives will find the high speed service convenient if there is a stop here. New Brunswick would also be the logical stop for travel between Princeton and New York and the Northeast.

While the new service is being tested here, New Brunswick will be a center of interest for all people interested in railway progress, and the refurbishing of the Pennsylvania Station here for the Rutgers bicentennial will come at a time appropriate in railroad history too.

Wyoming VISTA Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging fronts in the war on poverty is VISTA. The Volunteers in Service to America have asked and answered the question of what they can do for their country. VISTA initiated a program in October at Fort Washakie in Wyoming. The understanding and assistance of VISTA volunteers has won the respect and gratitude of our entire State. In this regard, I am pleased to enter the statement of Gov. Clifford P. Hansen in proclaiming this week as VISTA Week in Wyoming.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas the war on poverty is the concern of all citizens and its successful waging can bring new hope and opportunity to those fellow Americans who do not share in this Nation's promise; and

Whereas one of the most effective means of eradicating poverty is through the efforts of individual persons who live and work with the poor; and

Whereas the Volunteers in Service to America are fellow citizens who have chosen to devote 1 year of their lives to this nationwide effort and are now seeking others who join their ranks; and

Whereas many people in Wyoming are eligible to join VISTA—retired teachers, technicians, young college graduates, husband and wife teams who are seeking new programs to offer encouragement and assistance, can work with people in 1 of the 50 States and U.S. territories; and

Whereas the Wyoming courage and experience in fighting hardship is an important asset for VISTA volunteers; Wyoming people can carry their spirit and skill to the poor people of America, in rural and urban communities wherever poverty exists:

Now, therefore, I, Clifford P. Hansen, Governor of the State of Wyoming, do hereby proclaim the period of January 9 through January 15, 1966, as VISTA Week in Wyoming and urge all who can to explore this opportunity to serve America on its diverse home fronts.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Wyoming to be affixed this 4th day of January, 1966.

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN,
Governor.

Invocation for Navy Day Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the invocation for the Navy Day luncheon celebration, given by the Reverend Howard Dalton of the First Methodist Church in Santa Rosa, Calif., was unquestionably one of the most impressive opening prayers I have had the privilege of hearing.

In observing the comments and reactions of the Navy personnel in attendance at this luncheon, I was convinced that they were equally impressed. Therefore, I take this opportunity to include Reverend Dalton's prayer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues in the Congress.

INVOCATION FOR NAVY DAY LUNCHEON

Dear Lord and Father of all mankind. We come unto Thee with gratitude in our hearts and words of praise upon our lips. Receive our thanks for the good earth, upon which we are privileged to live, and all the blessings that come unto us from Thee.

We praise Thee for the ideals of our forefathers who lived dangerously, fought heroically, and served courageously to gain and maintain our freedom. Give us a renewed vision of the true meaning of freedom and a determination to preserve and extend it unto all Thy children.

May Thy richest blessings be upon the Commander in Chief of our Nation and all others who guide the policies and destiny of our Nation. Endow them with divine wisdom that in all decisions made Thy will shall be done on earth.

As our attention centers upon the Naval personnel who have and continue to serve so faithfully, we give thee thanks for each of them who have given so much for us. Graciously bless the officers and men of our Navy. Guard the ships that plow through the waters of the seas in their efforts to preserve peace, relieve the oppressed and maintain freedom in our world.

Bless all nations of mankind on the face of the earth and hasten the time when the principles of holy religion shall so prevail that none shall wage war any more for the purposes of aggression and none shall need it as a means of defense.

Bless the food of the hour and strengthen our bodies to do Thy will in all things, we pray in Thy Holy Name. Amen.

Gemini 7 Nearing Final Laps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Dallas Times Herald featured an article by Alvin B. Webb, Jr., on December 17, 1965, which catches the flavor of the final laps of the flights of Gemini 6 and 7 and the total dedication of our astronauts reaching the objective of landing on the moon by 1970. The dialog between the Houston control and astronauts Frank Borman and James Lovell typifies their dedication to fulfilling our national objective. I commend the reading of this dialog in the last hours of the flight:

GEMINI 7 NEARING FINAL LAPS: PICTURES TAKEN AT RENDEZVOUS ELATE SPACEMEN

(By Alvin B. Webb, Jr.)

SPACE CENTER, HOUSTON.—Space kings Frank Borman and James Lovell, joking and cheerfully recalling their tremendous experience of rendezvous with Gemini 6, sped today toward their 14th and final day in orbit and an Atlantic splashdown tomorrow.

While earthlings viewed the first spectacular film of that nose-to-nose formation flight, the Gemini 7 crew fought off problems with a pesky fuel cell electrical supply system and received a "go" for their 14th day.

Their space buddies, Gemini 6 Pilots Walter Schirra and Thomas Stafford, returned today to Cape Kennedy. Gemini 6 brought back the first pictures of a spaceship in orbit—a fantastic view of Gemini 7 close to within 6 feet of it Wednesday.

Astronaut Elliot See told Borman and Lovell the pictures "are remarkably clear * * * just every little detail as clear as a bell. You look just great sitting up there."

"Well, thank you," the obviously pleased Borman replied. "It was a tremendous experience.

"We're really in pretty good shape." Borman reported. They were in their 195th orbit.

They were also told the filmstrips were shown over television networks, to which Borman quipped in jest: "And we are in our underwear."

Borman also had a word to say when ground stations told them Schirra and Stafford stepped from their capsule Friday as if they had been up for a brief jet plane ride:

"That's all they did, for crying out loud."

Flight Director John Hodge said he was "very happy" today with the erratic fuel cells on the Gemini 7.

"All the systems we have looked at are going extremely well," Hodge said. "There's no reason why we shouldn't just go straight on downhill from here on."

Hodge said Gemini 7 had about 8 to 10 pounds of fuel left and would have half of that Saturday for reentry.

The fuel cell problems were considered so serious Thursday that it seemed possible the 14-day flight might be cut short. But there was no talk of that today either at the space center or in the spacecraft where Borman and Lovell, cheerful and relaxed, chatted with pround controllers.

Both astronauts awoke chipper and responded crisply when See radioed an updated flight plan to them.

"Hi, there, Houston, how are you this morning?" Borman said "Did you sleep well last night?"—turning the tables on ground controllers, who have been asking continual questions on the astronauts' condition.

See filled Borman in on Schirra's pinpoint landing near the carrier *Wasp* Thursday, and Borman said:

"Get that right. There's a lot riding on this." He and Schirra made a bet Wednesday during their historic rendezvous flight as to which would get the closest to the carrier on landing.

Lovell asked about his wife Marilyn, who is expected to give birth to their fourth child this month. Flight Surgeon Dr. Charles Berry told him there was "a little bit of a scare the other night but it didn't amount to anything."

He said Mrs. Lovell was sorry she didn't have the baby while Lovell was in orbit.

The first photographs showed the Gemini 7 spacecraft looking brandnew and gliding over the brilliant blues and whites of earth 185 miles below.

(The dramatic pictures, believed taken by Schirra, showed straps dangling from a thermal blanket attached to the rear of the adapter section to protect it from the bitter cold of space.

(The straps were left when the spacecraft separated from the launch vehicle.

(The object which Gemini 7 astronauts said hit their windshield shortly after launch December 4 apparently was one of the straps.)

The Gemini 7 spacecraft was also having troubles with two of its maneuvering rockets, but the problem was not serious and the fuel cells were receiving most of the attention.

Space agency officials denied they were gambling on the troublesome fuel cell electrical power supply units. They said the fuel cells would carry through with plenty of margin.

"I think nothing means more to Frank Borman and James Lovell than to complete this mission as planned" said Astronaut Eugene Cernan at a midnight news conference.

If all goes as planned, the champion astronauts will fire their four powerful braking rockets at 8:28 a.m. e.s.t. (7:28 a.m. Dallas time) Saturday and end their record-smashing cosmic journey with an Atlantic Ocean splashdown at 9:05 a.m. e.s.t. (8:05 a.m. Dallas time).

Ski in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Congressional Sponsoring Committee, I call your attention to the first annual Pennsylvania Ski Ball which will take place next Saturday evening, January 15, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in this city. The affair is designed to promote our State's rapidly growing recreation industry, particularly the outstanding ski resorts, as well as to make a contribution to assist in financing the U.S. ski team at the next Olympic games.

Winter sports enthusiasts in this area should be especially interested in the excellent winter sports facilities now available in Pennsylvania. It is a long day's trip to New Hampshire or Vermont, but Pennsylvania's winter wonderlands are between 2 and 4 hours by car from the Nation's Capital. Many groups and families leave Washington on Friday afternoons to enjoy full weekends of winter sports in our State.

Gov. William Scranton and Senators HUGH SCOTT and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., are honorary chairmen of the Pennsylvania Ski Ball sponsored by the Pennsylvania Society of Washington. General chairman is Attorney William D. Patton, of Johnstown, who is vice president of the society. We all invite you to take advantage of the healthy recreational facilities that are in such easy reach of this area.

German Government Statement Supports President Johnson's Vietnam Peace Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1966, the Federal Republic of Germany issued a statement which gives strong and unequivocal support to President Lyndon B. Johnson's effort to bring peace to Vietnam.

I am personally pleased that the German Government at Bonn has endorsed this U.S. diplomatic initiative.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT ISSUED ON JANUARY 7, 1966, BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY IN BONN

At the end of the past year, President Johnson announced that the bombing of Vietnam has been temporarily discontinued. At the same time, he repeated that the United States is ready to enter discussions or consultations with any government at any time, and without preconditions.

The sincerity of the American efforts for peace, and the desire to reach a negotiated settlement, become clear from the 14-point program in which the American Government points out that the Indochina Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962 could well form the basis for peace in southeast Asia.

The German Government has always maintained that the defense of the freedom and independence of Vietnam, by the United States, is of the greatest importance for the entire world. It supports all efforts toward a peaceful conclusion of the conflict, aiming at the maintenance of a free and independent Vietnam. It especially welcomes the declaration of the American Government that the Vietnam question must be solved by the people of Vietnam on the basis of their own freely arrived at decision.

Within the framework of a far-reaching diplomatic initiative, the United States has demonstrated its will for peace. Its efforts deserve the concurrence of all who love peace. The German Government and the German people welcome and support this position of the United States of America, borne as it is by a high sense of responsibility.

Private Foundations and Community Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence M. Stone, tax legislative counsel, Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, recently delivered a most incisive speech on taxation and charitable giving before the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles.

Mr. Stone's remarks provide a most valuable analysis of public policy concerning the tax status of publicly supported and privately supported foundations. His speech points out both abuses and benefits of our present tax laws. The operation of foundations is an area of deep concern to all Members of Congress and I commend Mr. Stone's speech to their attention as a fine contribution in this field:

PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS AND COMMUNITY FUNDS

(Address by Lawrence M. Stone, Tax Legislative Counsel, U.S. Treasury Department, Before 3d Biennial Seminar on Taxation and Charitable Giving of the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles, Beverly Hills Hotel, Beverly Hills, Calif., Dec. 2, 1965)

Neither charity nor organized community charitable enterprises are new to the Jewish people. Indeed, such endeavors are among our most ancient traditions. They are, perhaps, one of the reasons for the stubborn survival of the Jews through centuries of hostile environment.

The modern notion that the poor have a right to assistance is deeply imbedded in Jewish tradition. The Hebrew word "mitzvah," frequently used to connote "good deed," means "commandment." The common term for charity, "tsdokeh," can be defined as "social justice." In the meanings of both of these words one finds a clear sense of the obligation which charity carries for those who can do it and the entitlement which it establishes for those who need it.

The Jewish people have, moreover, looked upon the obligation to do charity and the right to receive it as principles to be enforced by the community. Community leaders are charged with responsibility for conducting charitable campaigns. The community as a whole judges the ability of each of its members to give. Those who fail to give according to their resources must answer to the community. In these very real senses, Jewish tradition makes charity a plain and important public matter.

Yet charity is not necessarily performed only through community action; good works do not always spring from such public sources. Indeed, one of the more remarkable phenomena of American society in the last 25 years has been the growth of the so-called private foundation. Charitable organizations of this type are ordinarily established, endowed, and directed by a single individual or a family; and, in that sense at least, they are private. Today a number of such foundations have assets worth many millions of dollars. The largest—the Ford Foundation—has assets of several billions of dollars. The total number of private foundations in the United States appears now to be well over 15,000. In both wealth and quantity, then, the privately supported charitable enterprise has become an increasingly significant feature of modern American charity.

A number of important differences attend the distinction between charity which draws its support and direction from a broad public base and charity which finds its origin in the decisions of one individual or a limited group. The existence of those differences and the significance of their social implications have received clear recognition in our tax laws and in pending proposals for revision of the tax laws. It is to the character of these two forms of charity—the publicly supported and the privately supported—and the difference in their tax status that I should like to address myself tonight.

The most prominent illustration of privately based charitable endeavor is the private foundation. Early this year the Treasury Department submitted a report on organizations of this class to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. The product of more than a year of investigation, research, and analysis, the report discusses the part which the private foundation plays in American philanthropy, appraises the actual performance of such foundations, points out areas of abuse which have developed, and recommends legislative action to deal with these problem areas.

The report begins with a recognition that the accomplishments of private foundations have been impressive ones. Beyond that, the report reflects, I believe, a firm and abiding conviction that the private foundation, as an institution, possesses characteristics which make it capable of unique and essential contributions to the conduct of charity in this country. Readily informed, available even to persons of relatively modest means, often capable of simple and informal management, the private foundation has very special qualifications to develop and harness individual creativity, promote new ideas, advance new causes, and move with speed and flexibility into emerging areas of need. The frequent freedom of private foundation funds from commitment to specific, budgeted operating programs enhances the flexibility of the institution and enables it to provide powerful impetus for growth and evolution in the focus and direction of charity.

On the other hand, any thorough examination of the activities of a broadly representative group of private foundations forces one to conclude that serious, quite fundamental abuses have arisen among a substantial minority of these organizations. The Treasury Department Report describes six major areas of difficulty. The absence of clear and easily administrable restrictions upon dealings between private foundations, their managers, donors, and related parties has permitted unfortunate diversions of foundation assets to private advantage. Protracted retention of income by some private foundations, or investment in assets of low current yield, has occasioned unwarranted delay in the application of funds to the support of active charitable projects. The involvement of private foundations in the conduct of business enterprises unrelated to their charitable functions has produced a variety of unfortunate consequences. Contributions to private foundations of stock in corporations over which the donor continues to maintain control (or contributions of interests in other donor-controlled property) have, in many instances, given rise to little benefit for charity and sharp conflicts of interest for donor and foundation. The present broad powers of private foundations to borrow and lend, or to trade and speculate with their assets, have created a number of abuses. Donor control of unlimited duration has permitted the misuse of foundations for private purposes, the perpetuation of dormant or obsolete foundations, and the development of rigidity and parochialism in foundation management.

Some examples of these abuses are, I think, enlightening.

One private foundation made 29 loans to its principal donor during a single 5-year period.

A group of three private foundations, all controlled by one individual, made a wide variety of large loans to that individual's friends and business acquaintances. One businessman, for example, owed the three foundations $6,571,448 at the end of 1956.

Another private foundation has assets which are very conservatively estimated at half a billion dollars. It is thus one of the largest foundations in the country. During the period from 1947 to 1965 the organization devoted a total of only slightly over $5½ million to charitable projects. Its annual support of charitable activities during that period, in other words, averaged less than one-tenth of 1 percent of its asset value.

A different private foundation holds controlling interests in 26 separate corporations, 18 of which operate going businesses. One of the businesses is a large and aggressively competitive metropolitan newspaper, with assets reported at a book value of approximately $10,500,000 at the end of 1962 and with gross receipts of more than $17 million for that year. Other corporations in the group operate the largest radio broadcasting station in the State, several banks, three large hotels, a lumber company, a variety of office buildings, and a garage. Concentrated largely in a single city, these properties constitute an economic empire of very substantial power and influence.

A different private foundation controls 45 business corporations. Fifteen of them manufacture clothing; seven conduct real estate businesses; six operate retail stores; one owns and manages a hotel; others carry on printing, hardware, and jewelry businesses.

Another private foundation owns a minority interest in a family controlled corporation. The members of the family claimed charitable deductions of almost $2 million for their contributions of stock in this corporation to the foundation, but the stock has paid no dividends in the years from 1948 through 1957, none for 1962 or 1963, and only token dividends for the years 1958 through 1961.

Another private foundation, entirely through the mechanism of investment borrowing, was able to increase its net worth from $1,000 to $1,150,000 in 5 years. This remarkable financial expansion took place quite without the benefit of contributions and, therefore, without the salutary outside scrutiny which reliance upon contributors implies.

These examples are striking; but they are not unique. On the contrary, they fairly represent types of actions and practices of which there are many other instances. I believe that all of us would agree that the activities which they illustrate are ones in which foundations simply should not be involved. The Treasury Department report recommends specific legislative action to deal with each of these areas. On August 27 of this year, in a joint statement, Chairman Wilbur Mills and ranking minority Member John Byrnes asked for written comments from the public on the Treasury Department's report. Statements of Representative Wright Patman and Senator Albert Gore also indicate strong congressional interest. All point to the clear possibility of congressional action in the near future.

The Treasury proposals would heighten the tax distinctions which Congress has already made between private foundations and other types of charitable organizations—generally, the publicly supported charities.

In 1950 rules concerning prohibited transactions and unreasonable accumulation of income were applied to private foundations.

In 1964, when Congress increased the general limitation upon the amount of deductible charitable contributions which individuals can make each year from 20 percent of adjusted gross income to 30 percent, it excluded donations to private foundations from the increase. At the same time, Congress placed special limitations upon the kinds of private foundations which can qualify to receive the unlimited charitable contributions permitted to individuals in certain instances.

A third differentiation between private foundations and other classes of philanthropic organizations occurred in the 1964 legislation: in initiating a provision allowing individuals a 5-year carryover of charitable contributions which, in a particular year, exceed deductible limits, Congress did not extend this benefit to contributions made to private foundations.

The clear tax differentiation between private foundations and publicly supported charitable organizations stems in part from a fundamental conviction on the part of Congress that charitable enterprises which lack the watchful and active participation of the public are particularly susceptible to abuse.[1] The specific instances of abuse which I have described, and the current Treasury legislative proposals designed to deal with the problems which they exemplify, demonstrate the soundness of that conviction. The view is not that privately based charity is not good: the long continuation of tax deductions and exemptions for such charity provides a convincing affirmation of the congressional belief in its value. Rather, the view is simply that, in the case of private foundations, care must be taken to prevent misuse of charitable wealth and to protect the public interest in such wealth.

By way of contrast, let us turn our attention for a moment to a class of public charitable organizations with which you are all familiar—community funds or community foundations. A variety of important attributes lend an essentially public character to these organizations. Their management, for example, ordinarily is genuinely public. In many instances the persons charged with responsibility for the disbursement of their funds are public officials or other prominent members of the community. Commonly these persons are chosen for their knowledge of the affairs and needs of the community, for their experience in dealing with public problems, for their close relationship with active charitable endeavors in the community, and for their abilities to invest and manage wealth wisely. They are not selected for their relationship to one of the foundation's donors, or for their willingness to submit to his desires—as is often the case with the managers of private foundations. While such managers of private foundations often act for the public good, they still are not representatives of the general public. The freedom from such private pressures of community foundation managers, however, enables them to act as effective representatives of the general public.

Another public characteristic of the community foundation is its special qualification to identify and cope with the problems of the particular segment of the public which it serves. By drawing its direction and financial support from the residents of the community, the organization enlists in its affairs those most likely to be aware of, and responsive to, the needs of the community. Persons with sufficient means can create individual funds within the general framework of the foundation if they wish their contributions to be devoted to the solution of particular community problems. Other members of the community, whose contributions are not of sufficient magnitude to justify the creation of separate trusts or who wish to provide the foundation with flexibility by allowing their contributions to be applied to the general purposes of the organization, can give to the foundation's general fund. This broad availability to the different elements of the public who wish to support charitable works within the community contributes significantly to the public character of the community foundation.

---

[1] The distinction rests also upon a second ground: it represents a careful congressional balancing of the financial requirements of operating charitable institutions against those of private foundations.

In fixing the guidelines for use of their funds, community foundations have been careful to avoid an essentially private—and often crippling—feature of some private trusts and private foundations. We are all familiar with notorious cases of trusts created in perpetuity for purposes which have long since become obsolete. Perpetual funds have, for example, been established to provide for retired windjammer seamen, to purchase and locate horse troughs "wherever they may be needed," and to assure an adequate supply of spinning wheels for retired spinsters. In cases of this kind, the donor's effort to set his perpetual, private imprint upon the funds which he consigns to charity results, over time, in the diminution and ultimate cessation of the social utility of his gift. The judicial principle of cy pres, which under certain circumstances permits application of charitable trust funds to uses other than those specified by the grantor of the trust, has proved to be of quite limited flexibility; and resort to it is necessarily both time consuming and expensive. Community foundations have dealt wisely with this problem, by insisting that their donors accord them freedom to vary the uses to which donated funds may be put if social changes make variation appropriate. In that way, they have rejected the encrustations of perpetual private restrictions and have maximized their ability to discharge their public responsibility by responding to the changing conditions of their communities. Similar problems often arise when the donor of a private foundation unduly restricts the investment powers of the trustees by insisting that corpus be kept invested in a particular asset. Such restrictions often become impractical and detrimental with the passage of time. A community foundation can also avoid such problems.

Community foundations manifest their character as public charitable institutions in yet another way. Commonly, they make detailed periodic reports of their activities to the members of the community which they serve. By doing so, they expose their charitable projects and their investments to searching public scrutiny. This full disclosure of their operations to public view minimizes the opportunity for abuse and contributes substantially to the development of public confidence in them.

The broad public base of the community foundation confers other advantages upon it. By consolidating within a single entity the resources of many individual donors, such foundations are able to secure administrative and operational benefits which would be unavailable if their contributors established their own separate and discrete private foundations. Investment and other financial services can be obtained more cheaply. Fund-raising costs can be spread more broadly, and their share of each charitable dollar can, therefore, be minimized. Capable, experienced, professional personnel—whose salaries would be prohibitively expensive for small individual private foundations—can be hired. In these respects, too, the community served by the foundation profits by the public nature of the institution.

Because of that nature, community foundations and those who contribute funds to them ordinarily receive very special Federal income tax treatment. Contributors may deduct their contributions to the extent of 30 percent—rather than the usual 20 percent—of their adjusted gross incomes. Donations in excess of the amount currently deductible may be carried over for deduction in the 5 following years. Donations may qualify for the unlimited charitable contribution deduction, granted to individuals who meet certain additional requirements. The restrictions which Congress has deemed it necessary to apply to the self-dealing and accumulation practices of private foundations have never been extended to the community foundation.

The existence of these special tax rules constitutes impressive testimony to the belief of Congress in the worth and the integrity of the publicly supported charity. As thoroughly public institutions, possessed of a variety of traits which fasten them firmly to the needs, support, and control of the segment of the public to which they address themselves, community foundations are prominent among the organizations whose performance has produced and justified that belief; and they share in the unique tax privileges to which it has led. With those privileges, however, there constantly remains an important public responsibility—a responsibility to maintain and improve the levels of performance of the past; to preserve complete freedom from abuse; to avoid lending its exemption to questionable tax saving maneuvers which may cause public loss of confidence in the wisdom of the tax benefits granted for charity; and, above all, to persist in energetic and imaginative response to emerging public problems. Familiar as I am with its achievements and principles, I am certain that—in the great tradition of Jewish charity—the Jewish Community Foundation of Greater Los Angeles will continue to contribute its full share to the discharge of that vital responsibility.

Thank you.

Travel Has Its Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment many of the Members of this body traveled outside the country. In my view—and in the view of many of our colleagues and fellow citizens—this is one of the many ways we learn about our jobs and how to do them better.

It is difficult, however, to pick up a newspaper or magazine that comments on this traveling without finding some slur cast upon the concerned Members. I am happy, therefore, to correct the impression that all journalists believe that the Members of the Congress live it up on the taxpayers' money while traveling during adjournment.

The following editorial appeared in the November 22, 1965, edition of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

TRAVEL HAS ITS VALUES

Elsewhere on this page are three comments on travel by public officials, our own on Senator Mansfield's touring "diplomats," Marguerite Higgins' on Governors who went to Vietnam, and Drew Pearson's on junketing Congressmen savoring the sunny delights of Hawaii (although many of them arrived during our recent "monsoon").

Government junkets are not in themselves wasteful of the taxpayers' money, although too many of them obviously are pleasure tours at public expense.

A conscientious public official on a study mission related to his public business can learn much of value to his constituents. The idea that we can provide all of our own answers for all of the problems that beset us is indefensible.

Hawaii has suffered from the provincialism of many of its earlier day politicians, who had no idea how things were done in other jurisdictions. That is being corrected, both by the election of more widely traveled people to public office and by a more liberal travel policy for both appointed and elected officials.

Certainly, public funds will be wasted on unproductive travel, and we should do what we can to prevent this. But it would not serve Hawaii—or the United States—to forego travel simply because a few junketeers abuse their trust.

Let's Remove Politics and Profit From the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following speech by Representative Don H. Clausen, of California, before the California State Chamber of Commerce. Representative Clausen is a great independent thinker with a wealth of fresh, interesting, and new ideas. His speech offers an incisive analysis of the poverty program.

The speech follows:

LET'S REMOVE POLITICS AND PROFIT FROM THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Address of Congressman Don H. Clausen before the California State Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Dec. 9, 1965)

The so-called war on poverty got off to a bad start and is still in deep trouble. In the past few days, scandalous headlines were appearing with increasing frequency as I left Washington. Many Members of Congress pointed out in the congressional debate this year the problems inherent in the law. It is not enough to put a good label on a bill and then to neglect meaningful standards and guidelines. The first thing that is wrong with this act is that it was not written by Congress but by the administration. As problems in the war on poverty have gained increased attention by the public, the administration, in its sensitivity, has refused to allow amendment to the act.

Last year when hearings on the amendment of the act were opened by the House Education and Labor Committee, Chairman Adam Clayton Powell charged that the war on poverty was a "giant fiesta of political patronage—a political porkbarrel" and made assurances that needed directives would be written into the law.

It appeared that something substantial would be done, but as witnesses appeared, testifying to the slipshod manner in which the program was being implemented, pressures were applied and the hearings were stopped after only 5 days of testimony. A few meaningless amendments were forced through Congress speedily and then, with the poverty program doomed to another year of operation without direction, Chairman POWELL hastily called for a complete examination of the program. A large committee staff was assembled, hearings were promised in the field, but following 3 months of investigation, nothing substantial has resulted.

The major issue of the war on poverty, according to the attention it has received in recent months, has been the issue of the involvement of the poor. A truly effective war on poverty will not do things for the poor people—it will do things with the poor people. This is the difference between the welfare-dole approach of the past and the potential of the future.

Almost any social worker or person working with the poor can tell you what the poor's problems are—lack of education, lack of a job and lack of motivation, among others. One of the characteristics of poverty is that it is generally handed down from generation to generation. No wonder many of the poor have become cynical, bitter and without hope.

If we cannot involve the poor in the solution of their own problems, they will have no place to go but to the streets. No one knows their problems better than the poor themselves. They must be involved in policy decisions of the program where proposed solutions to the problems are being developed.

Make no mistake about it—all the public relations work on the war on poverty has raised great expectations among the poor. We had better make this program work or its failures will generate a new and more serious revolt among the poor.

There is another reason why the poor should be involved in policy roles. Many of their frustrations derive from their conflict with the big city governments and institutions. In some ways they have good reason for frustration. Certainly our big city governments leave a great deal to be desired. If the poor are not involved they are going to fight and circumvent the existing institutions. This means picket lines, riots and demonstrations that waste energy and talents that could be otherwise employed. Involvement can show the poor that they can work through existing agencies.

This does not mean that local government, social agencies, and the State should not have anything to say. I am an advocate of local control. With the right kind of representative community action boards, dictation from Washington should become virtually unnecessary. To date the States have been completely bypassed and so have the poor.

During the debate last year, the Republicans proposed an amendment that would insure balanced representation on community action boards. Belatedly, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been applying our proposal, but it is not written into the law. Consequently, many communities have been torn asunder in the strife over the establishment of a program. Proper legislation could avoid this waste.

When the guidelines were first established for running the program, the administration showed little interest in the requirement that the poor participate in running their own programs. The first directives did not even mention representation of the poor, although the law requires "maximum feasible participation of the poor."

Mr. Shriver apparently now believes that the poor should not only help at the service level, but also at the highest policy level. The Bureau of the Budget and the administration apparently do not agree with Mr. Shriver.

Why is it important that the poor be involved? What will involvement mean? First, involvement will mean motivation. Being involved provides a glimmer of hope for people—that their opinions are heard and listened to. They see a channel of working out their frustrations and finding solutions to their own problems. Second, involvement means responsibility. In order for a person to act responsibly, he must be given responsibility. If he has no decision concerning the factors that affect his life, he will not feel that he is responsible to carry out the decisions made for him.

Why have the administration spokesmen suddenly become so cautious over this issue of involvement of the poor? The poor and their advocates have seen participation as an opportunity to change or overthrow existing institutions and government. The program, which the administration conceived as a political boon, or boondoggle, has suddenly boomeranged. The poor will simply not be pacified by another handout program when something new and better was promised and is available.

There is more to the poverty program than the question of involvement of the poor. There are other programs beside the community action program in which political motivation has compromised the effectiveness of the program. I am speaking particularly of the Neighborhood Youth Corps. This program, properly administered, could provide training for the great numbers of unemployed and unemployable youth. Instead, politicians have again stepped in to use this program for their own ends. Recent newspaper studies of Rhode Island Neighborhood Youth Corps programs are indicative of what is happening throughout the country. Rather than enrolling poor youths to whom this program would give needed income, training and motivation, enrollees are typically from families whose income is in excess of $7,000 per annum. Although this income level is not high, it is far above the poverty standard. Some of the youths, I was appalled to learn, were college enrollees. People have been placed on the payrolls of the program as supervisors, when they were performing no functions for the corps, but holding other municipal jobs. The list of abuses goes on and on. The Boston program is the most recent example of corruption. There, enrollees collected paychecks long after their names were off the payroll, and some employees of the program collected several salaries through the use of forged identification cards provided to them by the program's employees.

The Project Headstart section is generally recognized as the best part of the poverty program. It is interesting to note this section was originally proposed 4 years ago by Republicans, but turned down by the Democratic majority. It was included in an education bill I coauthored, H.R. 6422.

The question is, Where do we go from here? The Republicans in Congress joined by a number of Democrats, the National Chamber of Commerce and other organizations were opposed to the original legislation. The reason was not that we were against helping the poor; rather we were against the manner in which we felt this loosely drawn program would be administered. It is unfortunate that many of our objections have been borne out. Those include the lack of coordination, confusion, flaunting of established governmental structures and the cruel hoax of raising people's expectations far above the ability of this program to fulfill.

Despite objections, the war on poverty has become an economical, social, and political fact of life. We must deal with it as a reality. What are our alternatives? We can vigorously oppose the program, and by so doing, be charged with being against the poor. The second alternative is to ignore, or refuse to take part in, the war on poverty because this problem is not of our making. This approach would be to bury our heads in the sand, and, again, we would be charged with the responsibility for failure.

Our final alternative is to take an active part in the program. This is my recommendation. Our major targets should be the removal of politics and profit from poverty. The war on poverty is making many changes, some distasteful and some necessary, in most localities across the Nation. At this point, it may be to our best interests to take over and direct the poverty program with the dynamic and creative leadership that we know is available in the private sector. It is not only to our benefit, but it is our responsibility to take an active interest in these programs to insure that the decisions being made are carefully weighed and carried out in a proper manner. I am suggesting that the chamber members become, when possible, members of the community action boards. There may also be roles for you to fill in offering training experiences for program enrollees. This could be of benefit to the employer and the employee.

In this way, the poor can watch you in action. They will gain knowledge from your participation. You will gain more respect as a responsible community leader. As we all realize the war on poverty is far from the solution to the problem of economic deprivation in our country, we must seek other means of alleviating the problem. One of the primary problems of poverty is lack of employment by the poverty-stricken. Jobs must be developed for these people and more importantly, the people must be developed for the jobs. Those of us who have worked for a living or developed business enterprises know that the only real answer for reduction of poverty and unemployment is to create opportunities for the individual to become self-motivated, increase his productivity and add his effort to the acceleration of economic growth. Human energy is the mainspring to progress. Our continuing challenge is to develop programs that spark the enthusiasm of a young man or woman who is attempting to propel himself into orbit in the mainstream of American life.

With this thought in mind, a group of determined Republicans, myself included, have coauthored legislation that we think will truly provide this type of opportunity for working Americans. Rather than creating a new bureaucracy that might inhibit the management of the program, we have chosen to accentuate the positive aspects of existing institutions and enterprises. We have introduced the Human Investment Act package. The first of two bills in this package would encourage employers to increase their job training and retraining programs significantly by permitting them to deduct as a tax credit up to 7 percent of funds spent in such programs. When they provided the 7 percent tax credit for machinery investment incentives, I believe they left out the most important ingredient—incentives for upgrading the qualifications of human resources. The purpose of this legislation is to correct this oversight.

The second bill would permit employers to hire persons over 45 without serious concern over the extra costs involved for health insurance and retirement plans. This, too, would be accomplished by allowing tax credits to balance, in part, any such added costs.

In case you haven't guessed it, I'm trying to use the tax structure to help create incentives for people to advance their way in life rather than destroy their initiative through excessive taxation. As we seek means of improving our education, employment, and other programs for social progress, we must seek positive means of making the tax structure a constructive tool in our way of life, not a destructive tool. Proper tax reform is the answer.

Rather than taking away initiative by way of free money and help, people should be encouraged to become motivated volunteers by permitting them to take measured tax deductions if they, in turn, accept certain social responsibilities.

This approach may not fit the Great White Father's protocol of paternalism, but it provides unlimited opportunities for a man to chart his course toward a life of dignity, self-respect, and the cherished independence that remains the dream of freemen everywhere.

A Breakthrough in New Urban Transport Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, last session I introduced H.R. 9200, which would have amended the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for an urban transport research and development program.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] introduced an identical bill, S. 2599, which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Cabell], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Irwin], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCarthy], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Ronan], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

The January 1966 issue of Traffic Quarterly carries an article by me explaining the need for Federal research and development into the problems of urban transport, and outlining the provisions of H.R. 9200:

A BREAKTHROUGH IN NEW URBAN TRANSPORT SYSTEMS

(By Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

The most pressing transportation problem facing the country today is to devise systems of public transport capable of meeting the needs of large metropolitan areas.

As a cure for the intracity transportation problem, we are relying on the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. Unfortunately, the act can do little more than help cities purchase new buses or replace wornout subway cars. While this program has been helpful, the Federal Government has not taken the additional step it should take. It has not sponsored substantial research in an effort to develop new, dynamic systems which will provide urban dwellers with good public transport.

Within the past year, the administration has committed $90 million to a 3-year program to develop new modes of high-speed, intercity ground transportation. It has also given the go-ahead to a program to develop a supersonic air transport which could require as much as a $1 billion investment of public funds.

We should be making a comparable effort to develop new systems of moving people about within our cities rapidly, safely, economically, and efficiently.

Today, nearly three-quarters of our population lives in urban areas. By 1980 the urban population will be 80 percent of the total, or over 200 million people—more than the present population of the entire country. All of these people will have to move about the cities in which they live. We cannot forever depend on existing transportation systems. The Federal Government must promote the development of systems which will supplement existing modes.

In view of this need, during the last session of Congress I introduced legislation, H.R. 9200, to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 setting up a research program aimed at achieving a technological breakthrough in the development of new modes of urban transportation. Twenty other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation.

The bill carries an authorization of $10 million annually for the next 2 years—the remainder of the life of the mass transit program—and makes it mandatory that the research be undertaken. The research, the legislation specifies, must be designed to create completely new urban transit systems, rather than merely finding ways of improving existing ones.

SPACE AGE TECHNOLOGY IS NEEDED

Technological breakthrough is a space age phrase which has yet to be applied generally to earthly space age problems. Wonders have been accomplished in our efforts to send a man to the moon. There is no reason why this same genius cannot be put to use to send a man more speedily from his home to his place of work or other city destination.

A comparison of the Federal Government's expenditures for research and development illustrate dramatically how these efforts neglect common areas of human need. For fiscal 1966, the administration requested nearly $15.5 billion for research and development. Most of the funds were earmarked for the Department of Defense, the space program and the Atomic Energy Commission—$13 billion. Other agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, got lesser amounts totaling $2.5 billion.

Some Federal research and development funds do go for improving transportation systems. But here again the effort is badly out of balance, with no funds earmarked specifically for intracity transit problems.

Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, in testimony May 25, 1965, before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the administration's proposal, since enacted, to set up a Federal program to develop new modes of high-speed ground transportation for travel between cities, reported on Federal transportation research expenditures. He said that in fiscal 1963 the Federal Government spent $275 million for aviation research, $24 million for highway research, $15 million for water transportation research, and $7 million for research into intercity rail problems.

The funds invested in highway research, for example, were largely devoted to safety problems and ways to improve road design, construction, and maintenance.

Rail transportation research is being augmented during the current fiscal year by an additional $10 million as a result of enactment of the high-speed ground transport program. The remaining $10 million of the $20 million authorized for this program, familiarly known as the northeast corridor project, is being used for gathering statistics on ground transportation needs and demands—$2 million—and setting up a demonstration high-speed train to run along the corridor—$8 million. The Congress authorized a total of $90 million for the program over a 3-year period, with increasingly larger amounts going for research. Of the entire $90 million, the Department of Commerce has earmarked $8 million for the statistics program, $18 million for demonstration, and $64 million for research and development.

THE NEED IS FOR INTERCITY TRANSIT

It is well that the Federal Government intends to help achieve a technological breakthrough in rail transportation between cities, and in the supersonic air transport which will be able to fly at speeds up to 2,000 miles per hour. But we should recognize the equal, if not greater, need for a technological breakthrough in intracity transportation.

Few statistics are available on the demand for intercity, as opposed to intracity, travel. However, one of the ways of measuring the need for service, as Secretary Connor demonstrated in his testimony, is in population density. The Secretary reported, as part of his justification for Federal assistance to the northeast corridor project, that the population density of the area which the proposed system would serve was 854 people per square mile.

The population tables for 1960 show that in the 120 largest cities in the country, those with populations over 100,000, the population density ranges from 6,000 to nearly 25,000 people per square mile. While these figures are admittedly at best a rough guide, they do give an indication of where the need lies.

In addition, the advantages which truly effective and efficient urban transportation systems would offer cities are numerous.

Air pollution, caused to a large extent by automotive exhaust which continues to aggravate the city dwellers and to injure their health, would be reduced. Prof. Morris Neiburger of the University of California at Los Angeles, an expert on air pollution problems, has predicted that polluted air may well kill off our civilization within the next century unless the automobile population explosion is checked. In order to prevent this he suggests we need to develop a vehicle which has the advantages of the automobile but is not powered by the internal combustion engine.

Accidents as a result of transportation would be reduced. Private motorcars are the most serious cause of vehicular accidents, and in 1964 automotive traffic caused 1.7 million injuries, of which 47,800 were deaths. In urban areas alone there were 980,000 injuries and 14,500 deaths. In addition, the costs resulting from accidents are considerable. In 1964 the damage bills for all urban accidents amounted to $4.6 billion, with property damage accounting for over half, or $2.6 billion.

Good urban transport systems would reduce commuter costs. Automobiles are expensive to operate. Including depreciation, maintenance and repairs, fuel, insurance and other related expenses, a car costs between 10 cents and 12 cents per mile to run.

Finally, strangulation of city areas by urban highways, excessive numbers of parking lots, and all the rest that goes with present commuter traffic results in making our cities uglier rather than more beautiful places to live and work. Establishment of effective urban transportation systems would help to reverse this trend.

ACT NEEDS RESEARCH MANDATE

The Mass Transportation Act of 1964 authorized a total grant appropriation of $375 million over a 3-year period. The funds are given to communities to meet part of the cost of improving mass transportation facilities and equipment. The law also stipulates that of the $375 million, up to $10 million a year can be appropriated for a program of: "Research, development and demonstration projects in all phases of urban transportation (including the development, testing, and demonstration of new facilities, equipment, techniques, and methods) which he determines will assist in the reduction of urban transportation needs, the improvement of mass transportation service, or the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost."

This is not a proper mandate for the type of research program that is needed, for under this provision all the funds for research, development, and demonstration have been devoted to demonstration projects.

The cost of equipping our cities properly with existing mass transportation facilities has been put as high as $10 billion. Obviously, $375 million will not move us very far toward this goal. Thus, the demands on the program are considerable, and the administrators apparently have felt it necessary to apply all the program's financial resources (including the $10 million annually for "research, development, and demonstration") toward meeting the demand.

Writing in this journal for July 1964, John C. Kohl, Assistant Administrator (Transportation) of the old Housing and Home Finance Agency, the predecessor to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, described the Agency's policy toward the pilot mass transit demonstration project, which preceded the 1964 act:

"Further, the emphasis of the law upon 'carrying out urban transportation plans and research' has been interpreted to mean that demonstration projects should be oriented to operational problems and the practical evaluation of specific plans or the prosecution of basic transportation research."

The policy of the Department remains unchanged today.

While the demonstration grants no doubt lead to greater knowledge and understanding of urban transport problems, they do not begin to explore the possibilities that are on the horizon and where the real solution to our intracity transit problems lie.

Demonstration projects, as described by the Department, are categorized under three main types. The first type consists of testing the effect in changes in service and fare structure. The second tests new equipment and operating techniques (e.g., exclusive bus rights-of-way, new signaling devices, new fare collection equipment and new types of transportation systems), in order to evaluate their performance under actual service conditions. The third tests new techniques or methods for organizing, managing, promoting or coordinating transit operations.

An example of the type of new systems which the Department has assisted include Pittsburgh's skybus consisting of small lightweight vehicles capable of carrying approximately 30 people and operated along a separate right-of-way. Another example is Oakland's air cushion vehicle which is propelled by a turboshaft engine and capable of traveling over both land and water.

While steps in the right direction, these systems do not constitute a technological breakthrough. They are only a glimpse of what can be done as a result of extensive research.

INDIVIDUAL TRANSPORT DESIRED

The American people have an apparent desire for transportation systems stylized to their own individual needs. They want transportation which enables them to leave when they wish and go directly to their destination without transferring. Because existing urban transport systems do not satisfy this criterion, the city traveler today relies heavily on his automobile for getting about the city.

An October 1964 report by the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., of Buffalo, N.Y., for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy in the Department of Commerce documented this point in reviewing new urban transportation systems still in the drawing board stage. The study on which the report was based was contracted as part of the Department's analysis of transportation needs in the Northeast Corridor running from Washington to Boston between now and 1980 and designed to forecast new highway technology which might be utilized in that area.

According to the Cornell report, an urbmobile system which gives the city traveler "individual freedom, dispersal of origins, and feeder capability on the street networks, coupled with a capability to reach the city center under automatic control on a high-density track system" is the mode of urban transport which should be developed because it would meet the desire of people for individual transport.

The report stated that a new urban transport system "must, to a high degree, be immediately compatible with people and their established way of life, else it will not even survive its childbirth and growing pains." Therefore, it suggests, the "direction for development in commuter transportation that appears to hold more promise is that of an automated system of small individual urban vehicles." The report concludes:

"The automated portion of the system could properly be routed and integrated with existing streets and urban expressways to best serve the origin-destination requirements of both the suburban and the urban population. This system would, at least in its initial applications, be designed to supplement the existing street system rather than replace it."

THE COMMUCAR—A GOOD EXAMPLE

A good example of the urbmobile and the type of new system which could be developed under an extensive Federal research program is the commucar which has been proposed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The commucar was the result of a cooperative faculty-student effort in the spring of 1964 stimulated by the institute's natural interest in transportation problems generally and by its work for the Department of Commerce on preliminary aspects of the northeast corridor project.

The commucar is envisioned as a small, lightweight vehicle which can carry up to four passengers. It could travel along guideways getting power from an electric siderail, or it could be driven independently under its own power. Besides safety and speed, the commucar, as conceived, would have the advantage of taking its passengers directly to their destination without the necessity of transfer. Because the vehicle as designed would be light and compact, it could be parked easily and in constricted quarters, even perhaps racked one upon the other.

Other systems include the starrcar developed by the Alden Self Transit Systems Corp. of Westboro, Mass., and the teletrans devised by the Teletrans Corp. of Detroit, Mich. The starrcar is quite similar in function to the commucar, while the teletrans system confines its vehicles to the guideways, keeping them under automatic control at all times.

While technologically feasible, more research is needed before model demonstration systems for the commucar for example, can be constructed. Because of the scale of the project and the expense involved, this research is unlikely to be undertaken unless it is sponsored by the Federal Government. While conducting the research, the engineers could undoubtedly take advantage of advances made by the space industry, patricularly in the area of propulsion and computer control. Perhaps some of the space advances could be adapted to urban transportation use.

The automotive industry, too, would be able to contribute its expertise in developing the vehicles to be used in new systems, and then in manufacturing them.

In fact, the research program could, and should, go beyond merely developing the technological features of a new system. It should seek to determine the impact it would have on the society in which it will operate. As John Kohl stated in his July 1964 article in this periodical with regard to the pilot mass transit demonstration program then in operation, "Overall, the problems of urban transportation are being considered as integral parts of the physical and social complex of urban growth and change; they are not treated as isolated technical problems, to be solved entirely by transportation considerations." This is entirely a proper undertaking for any federally sponsored research program.

FEDERAL INCENTIVE NEEDED

Private industry, as it is expected to do now, cannot carry the burden of this research. Mr. Kohl in a speech to the National Transportation Engineering Conference in Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 19, 1964, pointed out that the transportation industry is slow to undertake its own research and development programs because of the difficulty of getting that investment back through the sale of the new equipment and systems. Thus, only a federally financed program can get the job done. The histories of the Manhattan project which ultimately produced atomic energy for civilian use, and of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which has contributed so much to our knowledge in the use of space vehicles demonstrate the value of a concerted Federal effort into a particular problem.

If the Federal Government had not taken the initiative in the development of atomic energy and space satellites, we would never have reaped the harvest we enjoy today. Without a considerable Federal effort to devise new urban transportation systems, it will be many years before we successfully cope with this problem. If we launch today a Federal research program for the development of new modes of urban transport, we can enjoy the fruits of the work in the 1970's.

The report of the Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory concludes that the Federal Government should undertake a research program to develop new modes of urban transport. Among its major recommendations for improving transportation along the northeast corridor it says:

"Initiate a program to define, design, and develop an experimental prototype urban individual transportation system employing a specialized form of vehicle and guidance."

The report goes on to point out that many of the technical and system aspects of new urban transport systems still in the drawing board stage have not yet been solved. Consequently, it says:

"Technical study in greater depth, accompanied by experimental development, is necessary before the technical feasibility, economics, and public acceptance can be realistically evaulated."

Furthermore, John Kohl, in an April 16, 1964, speech before the Conference on Responsibilities for Urban Transportation Planning in Newark, N.J., predicted that a Federal stimulus would be necessary to foster the research necessary to develop new systems and that the stimulus would be forthcoming in the then pending Mass Transportation Act of 1964. He said:

"It is confidently believed that a very modest Federal effort coupled with the program to improve the financial climate of the transit industry can unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities so far as urban transportation is concerned. As a result, there can be available in the not-too-distant future, better and more appropriate transit systems to complement our unexcelled highway facilities and to round out an effectively balanced system of community transportation.

"If we recognize the true nature of the present crisis—that of avoiding the loss of public transportation—we can avert it before it assumes staggering proportions."

Unfortunately, the stimulus that Mr. Kohl suggested would be forthcoming from the 1964 act has not materialized. Thus if we are to recognize the true nature of the present crisis we need to establish soon a federally sponsored research program that will unlock the great research and development talents of American industries and universities.

We know the technological breakthrough is needed: to develop systems which can carry people quickly, safely, and economically from place to place within urban areas, without polluting the air, and in such a way as to meet the needs of the people for individual transport, and at the same time contribute to good city planning.

The Rise and Fall of an Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the revolutionary fever of the 1770's, Thomas Jefferson declared as a self-evident truth "that all men are created equal." As the young nation pushed forward to become the large, diverse, rich nation that it is today, this truth seemed to be forgotten. While the United States suffered the growing pains of internal conflict, industrial development, and external threat, the question of equal rights was not often raised. Following the Second World War, Americans could no longer ignore the fact of unequal opportunity shared by so many fellow citizens.

This poem, written by Mr. Leon W. Grossman, a businessman and resident of San Jose, Calif., drives home the point that until the words of Jefferson are a reality, no nation can be truly great. I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that this poem be inserted in the Record:

THE RISE AND FALL OF AN EMPIRE

(By Leon W. Grossman)

Between those rugged widespread shores
The greatest of all nations
Contained the highest known to man
In modern civilizations.

A mere two hundred years of time
Had placed them on this steeple,
In all reality they were
God's truly chosen people.

Indeed they owe their fortunes
To great men who preceded
Entrusted with this heritage
In turn to be succeeded.

But at the pinnacle of height
Without warning or prediction,
There crept into their hearts and minds
A poisonous affliction.

With hate, mistrust, and prejudice
For selfish reasons beamed,
The streams of propaganda
Caused splitting at the seams.

Yes, history does repeat itself.
The Romans knew the sequel,
For to achieve the greatest heights
No man can be unequal.

Modern Relationship Between the Farm and City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, on last November 19 it was my privilege to attend a luncheon at the downtown Kiwanis Club in San Antonio. The speaker for the occasion was Mr. Brentano C. Harnisch, president of the Texas Grain and Feed Association. A resident of San Antonio, Mr. Harnisch is also secretary of the Pioneer Flour Mills of that city. The occasion commemorated Farm-City Week in San Antonio and Bexar County. The address was both timely and eloquent. It follows:

Several weeks ago President Johnson issued a Presidential proclamation declaring November 19–25 National Farm-City Week. In announcing this annual event, the President's proclamation said in part, and I quote:

"Whereas the American consumer enjoys such a great abundance of farm products, manufactured goods, and services that his standard of living is the highest in the world; and

"Whereas the farmer similarly looks to his fellow city workers for a myriad and quantity of manufactured goods, and the machines and power he needs for his work; and

"Whereas the American consumer now spends a record low of about 18½ percent of his disposable income for food compared with 27 percent during the late 1940's, I do hereby designate the week of November 19 through 25 as National Farm-City Week."

It is, therefore, a great privilege to come before you ladies and gentlemen today to discuss "Agribusiness Is Your Business."

When you try to analyze the relationship that exists between the city and the farm you are only trying to describe a parade that changes continually while you describe it. It is as if you were looking into a kaleidoscope where colors and patterns change so fast that the only theme you can find is the theme of change itself.

I guess I am in that middle period. Between the old and the new—young enough to remember that I used to chase women, but old enough to have forgotten why I chased them. I do not pretend to know farm life intimately, although in the flour milling business we are part of that great industry called agribusiness. I am a city man who has tried to understand farming from a seat on the sidelines, like a young student who hopes to gain a medical knowledge by watching Ben Casey and Doctor Kildare on the TV.

In a representative audience of about 100 men today, ask for a show of hands of all who have been born on farms: about 20 to 25 would respond. Then ask how many have sons who were born on farms; less than 10 would raise their hands. In this fact is the story of what has happened between country life and urban life.

One hundred and sixty years ago, just as the industrial revolution was getting underway, it required 19 men on American farms to provide enough surplus food and fiber to maintain 1 man in the city; today 2 men on the farm can provide for 18 men in the cities, and have considerable surplus. There are men still living who remember when more than half our employed men were on farms. The change has been that rapid.

For almost 2,000 years of Western history farmers had been in the great majority, so that both custom and law recognized the needs of an agricultural people. In the Western world the precepts of Christianity fitted well into the developing moral code of agriculture; our Ten Commandments were revealed to a farmer-sheepherder. But city people, from earliest days, tended to stray away from this ancient code. Wealth was centering in the cities, and an old philosopher noted that "where wealth accumulates religion decays." Cities became examples of transgression; historians have told us lurid stories of the licentiousness of cities; stories of Babylon, and of Sodom and Gomorrah. A deeply spiritual farm people have always distrusted the life of the cities. Thomas Jefferson thoroughly distrusted city life, and sought to plan a nation that would forever be dominated by small and independent farmers. Alexis de Tocqueville of France, that most gifted political scientist of the 19th century, came to America 130 years ago to study our young democracy in depth. He was impressed by the very high value placed on two things: individual freedom and social equality, two of the cardinal points in the dream of an agricultural people.

He could not then foresee, of course, that within a hundred years other great societies would emerge into history to proclaim the virtue of mass rights against individual rights. He could not foresee this day when one-third of the people of the world officially reject the idea of private property, and, like sodom, deny that there is a God. The old moral code of our agricultural people is challenged throughout the world today; the ancient faith of the farmer is pitted against the changing faith of industrial man.

I have used the word "farmer" as if it had specific definition, which, of course, it does not have. A man may be classed as a farmer on 10 acres, or upon 10,000. He may be identified in the census as a farmer when he earns the greater part of his annual income from off-farm industrial work. He may be a successful farmer or rancher, or may be a ne'er-do-well practicing failure on the same number of acres. He may be an orchardist in California who hasn't the slightest knowledge of wheat growing in Texas, or a bean grower in Colorado who thinks that Florida avocados are some species of small burrowing animal. There is no generalization for the word "farmer." A Kentucky tobacco grower was visiting on a Texas ranch. Seeing some calves he remarked: "I suppose you would call them cowlets." The rancher replied quickly, "no, we call them bullets." Farming is surely a many-sided thing.

Take, for instance, the inclination of our politicians to talk of farmers as the very low income people—all farmers as a class. But we have some 3 million so-called farmers and almost one-third of them are either subsistence farmers, or farmers earning much of their income at off-farm jobs. Perhaps a third of the men classed as farmers today could, if required, produce all the food and fiber needed by our people at home; these are the so-called commercial farmers, whose annual incomes can match or surpass the average income of city professional people; there are individual farmers who gross $1 million or more per year.

When you take the big commercial farmers, the small farmers, the part-time farmers and the subsistence farmers and put them all on one adding machine, the average income comes out pretty small, as would the average for all so-called businessmen. Some of the best of them, of course, like the best of businessmen, have years of loss. I remember explaining to a farmer friend how our Texas grain and feed association is a not-for-profit organization. He thought a minute, then said that his farm was also a not-for-profit business, although he hadn't planned it that way. Our Nation is still afraid of the larger commercial farmers and various States have passed laws to prohibit corporation farming. In every Congress proposals are made to limit the amount that the larger farmers may draw in crop support money. The Congress seems to have some complex about protecting the family farm; when, in fact, the percentage of farms owned and operated by families is growing every year without Government urging; and while farms grow rapidly in average size, they drop sharply from year to year in the number of hired helpers. The explanation, of course, is bigger and better machines.

Only in the big cities of the East do you find still existing that old image of the farmer as an uneducated "hick." Out here we read the agricultural statistics. We know that the average commercial farmer today is better educated than his city cousin; that he has more money invested in plant and equipment than has the average businessman in the city; that he is the remaining bulwark of conservatism because he is the largest body of property owners in our Nation; that farmers are predominately the managerial class, while the majority of city people are in the wage-earning class. Some of our well known economists have painted a rosy future for American farmers. They predict the day when the line of population growth will cross the line of food production, creating a demand that will press hard against supply and permit farmers to administer their own prices. This is assuming, of course, that our society continues to support the principle of private property, and the law of supply and demand.

Some farm people have already had a glimpse of this future situation and have already started agitation for guaranteed minimum prices from processors, an agitation that seems certain to fail as long as they can and do produce more than the market can absorb. But the agitation probably will continue, for the farmer begins to realize the impossible price situation which forces him to buy his supplies at retail, and sell his production at wholesale. A part of the farmers restlessness has been shown in his long political pressure for Government support of his prices or control of his production, and it is just here that some of the confusions inherent in the democratic method show up. Neither of the political parties, neither of the major farm organizations, and very few of the big agribusiness groups have ever been able to agree upon a national farm program. We have tried about everything, and some of our experiments have been plain stupid. Only in this decade has the Congress finally decided to make a scientific and non-political survey of the whole farm problem with a view toward a permanent and national farm plan.

We have all poked fun at these clumsy political approaches to the farm problem; some of the experiments have been endured with patience by the people; other times the public has indicated a clear no to some proposal, such as the recently proposed bread tax. To some people this stumbling progress has been just a political farce, but to most of us it has been only a demonstration of the way that democracy works. We may fit and test, with frequent failures, but we consciously prefer this way to the mandate of a dictator whose snap judgment seldom is as safe as the flower judgment of the crowd.

Both city and farm people have been partners in one of the most unusual programs of history. Never before has any nation of people given so much, so freely, of its wealth to the betterment of other nations. Whether it was from the desire to just make friends, or whether it was from purely humanitarian instinct, we have divided our wealth of food and fiber with the have-not peoples, in an amount that is almost immeasurable in terms of money. So influential and important has this program become, that today our leaders have openly talked of a greater program whereby American food production can close the world hunger gap.

This would not be a small task. Two-thirds of the more than 3 billion persons living today are undernourished people, or people on the literal edge of starvation. One international economist figures that the per capita food production in the world today is lower than it was before World War II, and still is declining. India is a chronic supplicant for the surplus from our food supplies: Both Russia and China have in these very recent years needed important supplies of food from the free world of the West; South America is struggling through a never-ending rebellion of have-nots against the haves.

In the face of the world's hunger, American humanitarians have urged that we open our reserve acreage for maximum food production, in the hope that the Western world can close the gap of Eastern hunger.

It is painful, almost dangerous, to sound a questioning note here. If there is a world hunger gap, there is also a world population explosion. Some of our more prudent statesmen are suggesting that our almost unlimited bounty be conditioned upon control of the numbers to be fed. It would be of questionable morality, they say, to nourish a society into even greater population potential. There is even the question, they add, whether our charity would, after a short term of years, become a vested interest of the beneficiaries, and that our inevitable future inability to produce in proportion to their continued increase in numbers, would eventually multiply enemies where we had only sought to make friends.

Today we are engrossed in matters of space travel, in torturing explorations of an elusive peace, and in the restlessness of groups which claim the right to choose which, if any, of our laws they chose to observe. Basically, the changeover into the industrial age, and now into the approaching age of automation, will become a problem of numbers of people. A group of 70 of the world's acknowledged scientific leaders met in California last fall to study world problems. Their group judgment was that the increase of population is the "problem of our time." Dr. George Borjstrom of Michigan State University, at almost the same time made the flat statement that "the world's population is already two times too large." Dr. Earl Butz of Purdue University, within the same week, said that international agriculture is in a race against time and capital to meet the onslaught of the world population explosion. There is a slowly growing realization of this threat of numbers of people against happiness of people. But the exigencies of modern politics make it almost impossible to carefully test solutions.

A generation ago our city people were generously paying taxes to bring better information to farm people; we took pride in the research of experiment stations, and the devoted agricultural extension service. For we were then still largely farm people, in town as well as on farms, and the betterment of farm living consumed our whole interest.

Today the confusion of our cities demands a reversal of this flow of education and neighborliness. Farmers, by the very nature of their occupation, have time to think, and now they have the educational background and culture for implementing their thinking. Perhaps from this group, the farmers, may we expect leadership in the transition from the agricultural past into the industrial future. Perhaps they can translate the moral code that is derived from christianity into the disciplines needed by an urban majority that is drifting with every wind of selfish pleasure and group license. In the beginning our Nation was led, economically, politically, and morally, by farmer-statesmen, from George Washington of Virginia to John Adams of Massachusetts. From men who have the inheritance of our old moral code, and time to meditate away from the crowds, we may expect again the resurgence of the prophets of old.

For the old legends and the old faiths of the prophets do not die quickly. It is from the deep memory of many generations that you and we, city people and farm people, understand the significance of the phrase "bread cast upon the waters." Our accumulated racial conscience knows the warning of asking for bread, and receiving a stone. Who among you here today has not heard the parable of the loaves and the fishes? Who pretends that even the nuclear age has wiped out the meaning of earning bread by the sweat of one's brow?

Yes, our people have become an urban people, and we are caught in the tempests of change from an agricultural moral code to a different city moral code. The times demand leaders, and leaders, you know, are always teachers, just as Jesus was himself the great teacher of mankind.

If you who are farmers, and we who are city people, do not find some means of producing the teachers for a new age, we must face a world in confusion and torment, and lack the means to prevent Armageddon.

Come, let us counsel together in the name of our people. Let us accept the challenge of leadership, even at a time when leadership is dangerous; let us join together at some altar where we may break bread in memory of the broken body of Christ, who gave us the perfect example of leadership. Let us give meaning to the countless millions of human souls who open every morning's prayer with the ancient plea: "Give us this day our daily bread."

Let us resolve that man's gift of mental capacity shall not finally be declared a mistake in evolution. Let us so unite the better minds of both city and country that we shall know with surety that the "dwelling of God is with man; He will dwell with them and they shall be His people; He will wipe away every tear from their eyes, and death shall be no more * * *"

America's Deep Sea Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a very timely and most interesting address by Roger Lewis, president of General Dynamics, entitled "Our Deep Sea Frontier."

This address was delivered by Mr. Lewis at the 63d anniversary dinner of the Navy League of the United States, held in New York on October 27, 1965. I feel certain that many of the thoughts and views expressed by Mr. Lewis are extremely interesting, and I am therefore pleased to bring this address to the attention of my colleagues. It should prove to be thought-provoking and profitable reading.

The address follows:

OUR DEEP SEA FRONTIER

(By Roger Lewis)

I am delighted to be in such distinguished company and to have an opportunity to talk to you about our deep sea frontier.

If a man truly is known by the company he keeps, I'd be inclined to rest my own case on where I stand tonight—among friends of our great Navy and with those who believe that American military power is power for peace.

The theme of this meeting, "Our Deep Sea Frontier," is exciting, timely and urgent. The concept of the frontier has a deep and special meaning for Americans.

Since our earliest beginnings ours has been a frontier country. We have played a dominant role in the conquest of many frontiers—on land, in the air, in space. So intimately is the development of our country and its emergence as a world power dominated by conquest of frontiers that it is hard to say whether we stand today as the product of our frontier experience or whether some unique quality in our national personality has made it possible for us to force and use these vast frontiers for the common good.

Whether we are entitled to do so or not, we act as if any frontier is a special province for the American people—and often the rest of the world seems to regard it so.

It's been said that we are a restless, moving people. How could it be otherwise? Since our earliest beginnings, we've had magnificient frontiers of challenge and opportunity into which to move. Certainly anybody who reads a novel or looks at television today knows that the stamp of the frontiersman and of his hopeful, courageous and independent outlook on life are deep within us all.

First there was a land frontier. Less than 13 generations ago, about the time Michelangelo was painting the Sistine Chapel, there was not a single permanent colony on the North American continent and the new world was one vast frontier.

Perhaps this is where it all started. For certainly our forebears, most within the last two or three generations, left their homes to come here because it was a frontier—a place of adventure, of opportunity, of freedom.

In a hundred years or so, the eastern seaboard changed from frontier to thriving colonies—soon to be independent as 13 sovereign States. In the next hundred years, first the Ohio Valley, then the Midwest, finally the Great West were opened, settled, and bound together as parts of the United States.

The transcontinental railroad and the final Indian wars completed our westward land expansion and ended our land frontier—just in time to see the dawn of another great one, the air frontier.

Was it, after all, so surprising that the air frontier should be opened by two brothers from Dayton, Ohio, at Kitty Hawk, N.C., in 1903, with man's first powered flight?

Does it surprise anyone that Americans for 60 years have been in the vanguard of man's minute exploration and exploitation of the earth's air blanket?

Or that today's tremendous air commerce is carried largely in airplanes powered by American engines and developed by American industry?

Or that this new servant of man has led to powerful naval and air forces with which we help to keep peace and order in a troubled and changing world?

Probably not—for the air frontier was, to most of us, simply an extension of the land frontier.

Now we are well into the space frontier, the earliest beginnings of which were American too. In 1926 Robert Goddard opened the space frontier by developments in rocket engine technology that provided the key to travel outside the earth's atmosphere, either in orbit or in space flight.

In less than 40 years we have built spacecraft in one of which two men orbited the Earth for 8 days. We have photographed the surfaces of the Moon and of Mars. In this decade we will land three American men on the Moon to open the planetary frontier.

It is true that space is infinite and our efforts thus far only a beginning. But our scientists and engineers are clear about our role. Our people understand its importance, and its orderly exploration is planned and funded. Even if we don't know exactly where it will take us, we have a sense of its potential and its importance, and we are on our way.

But what about our deep sea frontier, perhaps the last and greatest of earth's physical frontiers? We've got a pretty good start, and so far it has a strong American flavor.

Since the construction of the first practical submarine for the U.S. Navy by John Holland in 1900, technology and the frontier spirit have broached the surface of the sea and begun probing the mighty and mysterious deep.

Driven by military necessity, the major burden has fallen on the Navy. Our greatest attention has been directed toward securing the undersea approaches to this continent and to vital lanes of sea commerce.

Recently, however, a wider horizon has opened. Research submarines such as *Asherah*, purchased by the University of Pennsylvania, and *Aluminaut*—which will be able to operate at depths down to 15,000 feet—purchased by Reynolds International, have opened the door to scientific exploration.

The Navy's Sealab II experiment off La Jolla, Calif., recently demonstrated that man can live and work directly in the ocean 200 feet below the surface for weeks at a time.

Our Navy has taken the lead in opening the deep sea frontier and, with an estimated budget of $130 million for oceanography, has enlisted the help of science and industry to develop more tools for deep sea exploration.

Eight other Government agencies will spend an additional $70 million in oceanography this year. The entire national effort is being coordinated through the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, headed by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development.

The promise is enormous. Just how enormous we cannot say, though we're certain that it is so. Even Jefferson, in authorizing the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, and Lincoln, in authorizing the transcontinental railroad in 1862, scarcely could have foreseen that our most populous State would one day be on the Pacific coast.

The Wright brothers, practical, shrewd, and imaginative as they were, wanted their invention limited to peaceful uses. They did not expect that an airplane would be able to fly either ocean in their own lifetime.

Bold and brainy as he was, I doubt very much if Dr. Goddard in his wildest dreams foresaw today's $20 billion Apollo program or tomorrow's man on the moon.

Perhaps it's foolish to try to define the future. Experience has shown us that, in the fields of science and exploration at least, we are constantly overestimating what we can do in 5 years and vastly underestimating what we can do in 30.

But our thinking has to start somewhere; you cannot begin until you start. So just what are some of the possibilities of the vast deep sea frontier now opening before us?

Within 5 years we could:

Build swift research submarines to take scientists anywhere in the ocean for extended observation, measurement and photography.

Begin underwater mining of minerals and ingredients for fertilizers.

Develop new drugs, antibiotics and hormones from marine life.

Develop a world network of oceanographic buoys to collect surface and underwater data on temperatures, salinity and currents to be telemetered back to land on command. (A Navy-sponsored prototype of such a system has already been built and is undergoing sea trials off Florida.)

Begin transporting oil from wells beneath the Arctic ice cap.

Within 10 years we could:

Develop nuclear submarines capable of 60-knot speeds.

Emplace underwater sonar beacons as submarine navigation aids.

Develop techniques to raise even the largest lost ships (perhaps by injecting buoyant foam into sunken hulls).

Develop scientific husbandry of sea food, improving the quality and quantity of lobsters, oysters and other marine delicacies in offshore farms and ranches, for example.

Develop systems to predict the weather and eliminate or divert destructive hurricanes.

Within 25 years we could:

Build underwater resorts from which vacationers could hunt game fish or prowl the oceans in mass-produced sport submarines.

Develop artificial gills that would let man reclaim directly from the sea the oxygen he needs for underwater work.

Great, wonderful, exciting possibilities? Yes, indeed. The deep sea frontier promises both adventure and hope for an exciting and wonderful world. But will it be an American frontier in the same sense that the land, the air, and the space frontiers have been American?

Unfortunately, I see no assurance on this point whatsoever.

A frontier is truly a no man's land. And the world of the underocean in 1965 is a different world from that of the air in 1903 or the world of space in 1926. We have competitors—bold, imaginative and competent—to whom the undersurface of the sea is perhaps even more important than it is to us. And they are hard at work to understand and to use for their own purposes the sea's bounty.

An international convention has preserved for each maritime nation its own continental shelf, but it has also opened up the ocean depths to any nation that can exploit them.

In a supplementary agreement, the Dutch, Danes, Norwegians, British and Germans have divided up the oil rights in the North Sea.

Russia is reported to have a fleet of 230 ships working in the marine sciences.

France is planning man-in-the-sea experiments to a depth of 300 feet and has built a vessel designed to go to 36,000 feet.

Japan has had a 650-foot-depth research submarine since 1960 and commissioned a 2,000-foot-depth vessel last year.

All the maritime nations are at the threshold of the deep sea frontier. There is active, aggressive competition and we must expect that it will increase.

Thus, to you who would take comfort and excuse delay because of our final successes in the air and in space, I must recall that, for many years subsequent to the inventions of the Wrights and of Dr. Goddard, development of air and space vehicles was more aggressively and more effectively pursued by Europeans than it was by Americans.

World War I was fought with European-designed and European-built airplanes. The first jet engines and the first jet airplanes were British, Italian, German.

In World War II, advanced rocketry was developed at Peenemunde, not Cape Kennedy.

Necessity and the frontier spirit first gave the United States the tool by which man can hope to explore and realize nature's vast undersea treasures.

Perhaps the most thrilling words in the long history of ship construction came from the submarine *Nautilus* as she sailed from Groton, Conn., January 17, 1955. She radioed: "Underway on nuclear power."

Since then, we have circumnavigated the globe under water. We have gone deep, and can go deeper still. We go fast and can go faster still. We are beginning to understand how to live in the silent and deadly deep.

But we must press on. The race is still to the bold and the brave.

Listen to what Comdr. Scott Carpenter, one of the Navy's astronauts who recently spent 30 days living and working under water in the Sealab II experiment, says: "In the space program I have seen how very much can be accomplished when a country gets behind a program. The oceanographic program very urgently needs more men, more talent, more money, and more public understanding than it has now."

The national space budget for this fiscal year is nearly $3 billion—15 times the national budget for oceanography.

Perhaps the time is not yet right for a national oceanographic program on the scale of the space program. Perhaps we do not yet know enough about this strange new world to mount such a priority effort and to spend such vast amounts of money wisely.

But certainly we must mount a greater effort to explore and probe its farthest reaches than exists today.

We need more and better undersea vehicles—nuclear and nonnuclear—small and large. We need detailed exploration, analysis and recording of every aspect of marine life. If we are to be the first masters of the sea, there is no time to be lost.

We need more tools, more effort, a wider scope. These are matters of vital national urgency now.

Our Navy has led us to a great beginning, but we have seen that invention and dramatic beginnings may not be enough. Now it is up to the Nation, to our total scientific, industrial, and military establishment to carry on and make the most of this glorious beginning.

This is where you and I come in. For this is a job of public knowledge and understanding—a job which the Navy League set out to do many years ago and has done so nobly.

The deep sea frontier may be one of the last and, perhaps, the greatest of all frontiers, but its exploration and exploitation will be time consuming and demanding. The prize will be rich, but will it fall to us? Will we be the ones to lift the veil and free her limitless bounty for the benefit of mankind?

One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in commemoration of its 25 years of service, the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee published an interesting and colorful brochure entitled "One-Quarter Century of Farm-Labor-Consumer Action." The purpose of the brochure is to review the history and accomplishments of the committee, and this purpose is certainly well achieved.

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee had its beginning in February 1941, when, due to the loss of an export market in war-torn Europe and the subsequent sharp drop in the price of fruit, Santa Clara County prune and apricot growers banded together to ask for purchase by the Federal Government of some of the unsold fruit. This first unified effort resulted in an appropriation of $25 million and a successful increase in the market price of fruit.

Behind the developing variety of programs which the committee has worked for, the overriding commitment was and is to the family farm, the farm which provides a living for a farm family, members of which do most of the work rather than directing the work of others. To help insure the economic survival of the family farm the committee places top priority in establishing jointly owned and operated farmer-to-consumer marketing and distribution cooperatives. To achieve this goal, the committee is working with farm groups, other cooperatives, and organized labor.

The hope is that such cooperatives will help to reduce the sometimes very great spread between consumer prices and what the farmer receives. For while the general standard and cost of living have been rising, the level of farm income has been a consistent problem. As "One-Quarter Century" illustrates, "from 1953 to 1964, net farm operator's income dropped at an average annual rate of 1.4 percent. In 1964 per capita nonfarm income was $2,595; in contrast per capita farm income was $966."

The Farm Research and Legislative Committee is not concerned only, however, with the level of farm income. The committee has taken an active role in the advocacy of a Federal food stamp program to provide a better diet for low-income families, of a Federal school milk program, and of lower gas and electric rates in the region. Further, their international concern is evident in the committee's early support and educational campaign for the establishment of the United Nations as well as the Food and Agriculture Organization's freedom-from-hunger campaign.

Accurately described in this brochure as the "nerve center" for the Farm Research and Legislative Committee is its executive secretary Mrs. Grace McDonald, who doubles her tremendous workload by serving as executive secretary for the Northern California Freedom-from-Hunger Campaign. Judging from the achievements of the past 25 years, I feel confident that Mrs. McDonald and her associates on the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee will continue to work successfully with and for farmers, laborers, and consumers in California.

Federal-Aid Secondary Roads—Our Stepchild Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, following my recent speech before the County Supervisors Association of California on the need for a more balanced highway system throughout the Nation, I have had numerous requests for the full context of my remarks.

Serving as a member of the Roads Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee, I believe the material contained therein would be of interest to other Members of the House. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I request unanimous consent to its inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN DON H. CLAUSEN BEFORE THE COUNTY SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA, OCTOBER 22, 1965

It is an honor and a privilege to have this opportunity of speaking to my beloved alma mater, the County Supervisors Association of California. As a former member of this political fraternity, I can assure you that it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome your organization to my congressional district. The fact that you brought this convention to our beautiful north coast is, I am sure, appreciated by the people of Humboldt County. But, I am also certain that those of you who are visiting the redwood country for the first time are equally pleased with the hospitality and exposure to this land of the tall trees.

In selecting a topic for today's presentation, I decided to touch briefly on a subject that certainly must remain close to each and every member of the boards of supervisors throughout this great State of California. It has often been said that "a supervisor who doesn't concern himself with the roads in his district can expect to be a one-term supervisor."

While we are interested in all types of roads—expressways, freeways, parkways, access and scenic roads, connecting roads, etc.—I believe the roads that require and attract the attention of county supervisors are the Federal-aid secondary roads.

During my service on the board of supervisors, it seems, we were always waiting for our allocation of funds so as to accelerate the construction of another section of roadway that was "crying" for improvement.

With this background, you can certainly understand why, when the opening occurred, I jumped at the chance to be appointed to the Road Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee. In the years to come, I hope my position and service on this important committee will prove beneficial to all concerned with highway matters.

In reviewing the progress of highway construction over the past decade, one must conclude that substantial headway has been made. Since 1947, nearly $6 billion have been spent on Federal-aid secondary highways. That money has improved more than 252,000 miles of roadway. In 1948, there were 378,000 miles of secondary highways. Since then the mileage has nearly doubled to 620,000 miles with about 18,000 miles in urban areas. This money has built 32,000 bridges, it has eliminated 600 railroad crossings and has protected over 3,600 railroad crossings with warning devices or gates. By any standard—this is a good record—it is an impressive record—but it is still not enough.

The needs, the backlog for construction and the deficiency lists continue to mount.

In my judgment, the importance of our secondary roads has never been fully realized. The financial resources have not kept pace with the increasing demand for improvement.

Speaking quite candidly, it has never made much sense to me to build great expressways and freeways for the enjoyment or safety of our traveling public and then subject this same traveler to narrow roadways or "cow trails" when driving on county roads. Certainly there is room for a more balanced recognition of our overall highway transportation requirements.

It would seem quite obvious to anyone that as we step up our efforts to improve the interstate and primary highways, we should certainly do the same for our secondary road system.

As highways begin to receive more and more attention because of the increasing number of vehicles, the growing number of miles traveled each year and the resultant increase in gas tax revenue, it would seem only logical that secondary road improvement would keep pace. Regrettably, I do not see this to be the case.

Secondary roads comprise about 20 percent of the total road mileage in the country, but the money authorized for improving and maintaining them amounts to only about 2 percent of the total.

It seems to me that as we seek a balance in our entire system of highways in this country, a more realistic allocation of the tax revenues to Federal-aid secondary roads would go a long way toward providing the answer.

With the State and Federal Governments having preempted the gasoline tax source of revenue—it would seem reasonable that we have the continuing responsibility to reappraise our revenue allocations with adequate attention given to the changing needs of the cities and counties. Certainly, without the tax source directly available to them, the supervisors hands are tied. If additional funds are needed to fund the programs, we at the State and Federal level must assume the leadership role and I can assure you, this is taking place. As you know the Ways and Means Committee has jurisdiction over additional revenues and again, our Road Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has forthrightly presented our case to the committee. The Transportation Committee of your State legislature have been equally aggressive at the State level.

At this point, however, I believe I should make known to you that your financial problems are not the only problems we must consider.

As you know, highway legislation before the House Committee on Public Works is generally handled in a bipartisan way. Shortly after the latest estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate Highway System was submitted to the Congress, the chairman and ranking member of our Road Subcommittee introduced bills which would have approved the cost estimate for the purpose of apportioning interstate funds and would have authorized the appropriation of an additional $5 billion to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System. The [illegible] authorization of $37 billion now re[illegible] billion. Enactment of either of these bills would have provided for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule in 1972.

H.R. 6548, was overwhelmingly approved by our Committee on Public Works and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means to take appropriate action with regard to financing. However, it soon become obvious that the Committee on Ways and Means had no plans to act on the bill despite the fact that in many States, the highway program was being delayed pending apportionment of additional Federal-aid highway funds.

As a result, it was necessary to act upon Senate Joint Resolution 81, which permitted apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds authorized for fiscal year 1967 only but did nothing to provide the additional funds necessary for completion of the Interstate Highway System on schedule by 1972. So, as you can see, we all have our work cut out for us. As you know, we in California want the complettion on schedule so that Highways 101 and 50 can be added to the Interstate System.

The only alternative would be to extend the scheduled completion date. To me, this is totally unacceptable in view of the fact that completion of the Interstate Highway System will result in an annual saving of 8,000 lives and $11 billion in transportation costs.

In order to emphasize my interest in the secondary road problem, I think it would be appropriate for me to read my comments made during the debate on Senate Joint Resolution 81:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 81, a resolution to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 to increase the amount authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, to authorize the apportionment of such amount, and for other purposes.

"I want to draw the particular attention of my colleagues to section 2 of the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-aid highway system after 1972. The Secretary would be required to submit a report of his findings to Congress not later than January 1, 1967.

"This study will include, among other subjects, the extension or improvement of the present Interstate System, the possible development of freeways or express routes on a different basis, special urban highway problems, classification revision for Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, and their urban extension, and other matters. I am particularly anxious that the study include a comprehensive review of the Federal-aid secondary highway system, and officials of the Bureau of Public Roads have stated that the study will do this. In a speech before the county engineers on February 21, 1965, Mr. Ralph P. Agnew, Chief of the Secondary Roads Division, Bureau of Public Roads said:

"'Such examination (of the secondary system) on an intensive scale is scheduled in the study being planned by the Bureau of Public Roads in cooperation with State and local officials to provide a sound basis for such a highway program in the future.'

"Mr. Rex Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, has also indicated that the study of future highway needs will include review of the Federal-aid secondary system.

"While the dramatic interstate highway program attracts most of the public attention, the Federal-aid secondary highway program is also of critical importance to the Nation's welfare. It is in the development of the Federal-aid secondary system that the voices of the county and other local road officials will most effectively be heard. Under the law, programs for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system must be selected by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. In addition to this, under the policies adopted by the Bureau of Public Roads, not less than 50 percent of the Federal-aid secondary funds apportioned to each State for any fiscal year after diversion of the highway planning survey funds shall first be made available to the appropriate road officials and shall remain so available until the end of such fiscal year for roads not on the State highway portion of the Federal-aid secondary system.

"The total mileage of routes designated on the Federal-aid secondary system, as of December 31, 1963, was 626,438 miles. The actual traveled ways of these routes totaled 618,041 miles. Of this mileage, nearly 180,000 miles do not have a paved surface.

"The highways on the Federal-aid secondary system are essential for the day-to-day activities of our citizens, particularly in view of our rapidly shifting population patterns. It is necessary that highways on the Federal-aid secondary system be improved to adequate standards in the interest of not only adequate transportation but also in the interest of reducing loss of life, injuries, and property damage which result from vehicle accidents on the secondary system.

"In light of these considerations, I was surprised and disturbed at the proposal of the President to divert one-third of all funds apportioned for the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the construction of scenic and recreational roads and landscaping and roadside development on roads, irrespective of whether they be on the Interstate primary or secondary system. I am certainly in favor of measures designed to protect and enhance the beauty of our highways, but I cannot believe that such should be done at the expense of needed highway construction. The diversion of needed highway funds from the Federal-aid secondary system, in my opinion, is deplorable. This is further emphasized by the fact that the proposal was not based upon any comprehensive study of actual needs of the Federal-aid secondary system and, in fact, was made in the face of the fact that, a study of all highway needs, including those of the secondary system is about to get underway, under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 81.

"Mr. Speaker, I strongly support Senate Joint Resolution 81 and urge my colleagues to join me in its support. I am particularly interested in the highway needs study provision, and am looking forward to the report of the Secretary of Commerce and its findings and recommendations concerning the Federal-aid secondary system."

In conclusion, I want to extend my sincere thanks to the supervisor of my own district and your great organization for sending Bill MacDugall back to represent you during the hearings on the previously mentioned move to divert funds from the FAS program.

I need not remind you of how magnificently Bill presents your case before legislative committees. Everyone on the committee was greatly impressed and the results speak for themselves. The pressures were so great the administration finally withdrew their request for fund diversion and asked that the beautification package be financed from the general fund. This was indeed a great victory.

Believe me, we have every reason to accelerate the construction programs now before us. We must meet whatever requirements are necessary to complete the system, but in the meantime, it behooves all of us to expand the cooperation and coordination of highway planning. We must restudy our highway needs with particular attention given to a functional reclassification of our highway systems.

During the past few years, we have concentrated on the critically needed Interstate and Defense Highway System. However, in my opinion, we should not concentrate solely on freeways and expressways—more attention must be given to the farm-to-market and secondary road systems. The Interstate System is a model achievement of what can be done with proper and coordinated planning. And yet, the Interstate System is only expected to carry 20 percent of the estimated 1 trillion miles that will be driven by 1976—10 short years from now. That other 80 percent—800 billion miles—will be driven on the primary and secondary highways.

It seems only logical to me—that our goal must be a balanced highway system. With transportation and highways recognized generally as the economic lifeline to a community, one can only conclude that a "balanced highway system" would mean a "balanced economic development" throughout our land.

With the acceleration of funds and a new emphasis on secondary roads, a comprehensive system could be developed that will speed motorists to their destinations in the safest possible manner.

And then one day, perhaps, we can minimize the slaughters on our highways that cost more American lives over one weekend than have been lost during our entire involvement in the war in Vietnam.

I thank you for the privilege of being with you.

Parrots of Penance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, what constitutes loyalty is an age-old question—the answer varies from nation to nation and within nations, from era to era. Our own Nation, with constitutional and historical guarantees for the freedoms of speech, press, and association, is subject to wide variations in the level of tolerance to critical discussion and dissent. Too often, the "loyal" American is the orthodox, the quiet, and the unquestioning American.

In verse form Dr. Gene Gordon brilliantly describes the relationship between loyalty, the social and political atmosphere, and "the very perfect model of a member of the faculty." Dr. Gordon wrote this poem in the midst of the loyalty oath controversy at the University of California around 1949. He was, at the time, a clinical instructor in neurology and studying neurology and psychiatry. "Parrots of Penance" has been printed anonymously in a journal of the New Mexico Association of Professors, the Northern California Civil Liberties News, and the magazine Monocle. Its wit and message commend it for all to read and ponder and so I include "Parrots of Penance" in the RECORD:

"PARROTS OF PENANCE"

(Tune: "I Am the Very Pattern of a Modern Major General"—Sullivan.)

I am the very model of a member of the of loyalty,
Because I'm simply overcome with sentiments of loyalty.
I daily think of reasons why I'm glad to be American,
And thank the Lord I've always been a registered Republican.

The thoughts I think are only thoughts approved by my community.
I pledge allegiance to the flag at every opportunuity.
I haven't had a thing to do with Communist conspirators,
And neither have my relatives, descendants, or progenitors.

I try to keep away from propositions controversial;
I've no opinions social, politic, or commercial.
And so you see that I must be, with sentiments of loyalty,
The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

CHORUS

And so you see that he must be, with sentiments of loyalty,
The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

II

I'm qualified to educate in matters of heredity,
Unsullied by the taint of any doctrinaire rigidity.
I teach the Darwin theory with valuation critical,
Uninfluenced by dogmatists religious or political.

I understand the economic forces that have made us great;
The system of free enterprise I do not underestimate.
I'm well equipped objectively to point out flaws in Marxist thought,
Because I've never read his work; and rest assured that I will not.

I freely follow truth in ways which I am sure will satisfy,
The Board of regents, William Hearst, and Hoover of the FBI.
And so you see that I must be, with sentiments of loyalty,
The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

CHORUS

And so you see that he must be, with sentiments of loyalty,
The very perfect model of a member of the faculty.

Big Red 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker the citizens of Birmingham and of the Sixth District of Alabama, which I am honored to represent, have selected a most dramatic way to demonstrate their support of our military effort in Vietnam and the unfailing courage of our fighting men there. By official proclamation of Mayor Albert Boutwell, the city of Birmingham has adopted the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army, more affectionately known as the Big Red 1.

Like so many other loyal patriotic Americans, the good people of Birmingham were disturbed and angered by the demonstrations and draft card burnings of a small misguided minority in this country—actions which have perplexed and even undermined the morale of U.S. Armed Forces engaged in a difficult and exhausting struggle thousands of miles from home. The citizens of Birmingham determined to show in a concrete and convincing way they were behind our men in Vietnam all the way.

The idea of "adopting" the 1st Infantry Division, now stationed in Vietnam, was first conceived by retired Brig. Gen. Edward M. Friend, Jr. It was an apt choice. The Big Red 1 is this country's oldest division and has an outstanding and much decorated history. It was first to shed American blood in France in World War I and first to land in North Africa in World War II. It sparked the conquest of Sicily, stormed across Omaha Beach in the D-day assault on Normandy, and was first in Germany with the capture of Aachen. The 1st Infantry Division also swept across the Rhine into Czechoslovakia—the farthest advance by U.S. troops in Europe in World War II.

The idea became reality through close and effective cooperation among the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Birmingham News, and the officials of the city of Birmingham. A special committee of distinguished citizens was formed by Mayor Boutwell to work on behalf of the city with the chamber of commerce. Those members are:

General chairmen: Mayor Albert Boutwell, Cooper Green. Cochairmen: Donald Stafford, Crawford Johnson III, Brig. Gen. E. M. Friend, Jr., USAR, retired.

Steering Committee: Tom Bradford, Miss Evelyn Walker, M. E. Hackney, John A. Jenkins, Dr. John Nixon, Dr. Lucius Pitts, Drew Redden, and Vincent Townsend.

The support of the Big Red 1 took tangible form at Christmastime when hundreds and thousands of gifts and letters were sent from Birmingham to men in Vietnam who would not be home for the holidays. That support continues and will continue as long as U.S. forces must remain in Vietnam to combat communism and defend freedom.

A Birmingham roll of honor has been organized, saluting organizations, compaines, churches, schools, and other groups that have adopted units of the 1st Infantry Division. Here is the list of sponsoring organizations and the units of the Big Red 1 adopted by them, as of January 1, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, here is, I know, the real mood and spirit of America: resolute and eager to support the fight for free-

dom in Vietnam. I salute the action of the city of Birmingham in adopting the 1st Infantry Division and I hope that other cities and towns across this great country will follow its inspiring example and let our men in Vietnam know that the overwhelming majority of Americans support their stand for freedom and against tyranny there.

BIG RED 1 ROLL OF HONOR

Alabama Bridge Association—1st Platoon "C" Co. 1st Engineer Battalion.

American Legion Post No. 35, Ensley—Headquarters Company 2–18 Infantry 1st Infantry Division.

Andrews Appliance & TV Center—701st Maintenance Battalion, Company "E".

Birmingham B. P. W.—Headquarters Company, Headquarters 2nd Brigade.

Birmingham Holy Name Union—"B" Company 1–16 Infantry.

Birmingham Jaycees—Company "A", 1–28 Infantry.

Birmingham P.T.A. Council—Headquarters Company 1–28 Infantry.

Birmingham Real Estate Board—"A" Battery, 1–7 Artillery.

Birmingham Retail Druggist Association—Company "A" 1st Medical Battalion.

Birmingham Rotary Club—Headquarters Company 2–18 Infantry.

Brownie Scout Troop No. 159 and Junior Scout Troop No. 683—242d Chemical Platoon.

Boy Scouts, Troop No. 94, Vulcan—1st Platoon "A" Company 2–18 Infantry.

B'nai-B'rith—Headquarters Company 2–16 Infantry.

Birmingham Committee of 100 Women—Company "C" 2–2 Infantry.

Birmingham-Southern College—D Battery 1st–5th Artillery.

Birmingham Trust National Bank—"A" Battery 2–33 Artillery.

Birmingham Association of Life Underwriters—"C" Troop 1–4 Cavalry 1st Infantry Division.

Birmingham Labor Council—2d Platoon "C" Co. 1–1f Infantry.

Blach's—"A" Battery 1–5 Artillery.

Berry High School "Hope Club"—Headquarters Company 1st Brigade 1st Infantry Division.

Birmingham Elks Lodge No. 79—Headquarters and Service Battery 2–33 Artillery.

Communications Workers of America— A Company 121st Signal Battalion.

City Salesmans Club—C Company 1–28 Infantry.

City National Bank—266th Chemical Platoon.

Chapter No. 1 Licensed Practical Nurses—B Company 1st Medical Battalion.

Civitan Club of Birmingham—B Battery 1–7th Artillery.

Church of the Advent—B Battery 8–6 Artillery.

Downtown Optimist Club—3d Platoon, C Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Downtown Exchange Club—B Company 1st-2d Infantry.

Downtown Action Committee—Headquarters-Headquarters Company 1st Infantry Division.

Elton B. Stephens & Associates—Headquarters Company "A" 701st Maintenance Battalion.

Eastern Area Chamber of Commerce—1st Platoon "C" Company 1–18 Infantry.

East End Council of Garden Clubs—Company "A" 2–28 Infantry.

Ensley High School—Company "A" 2–16 Infantry.

Ensley Kiwanis Club—"B" Battery 1–5 Artillery.

First National Bank of Birmingham—"A" Company 1–18 Infantry.

Forestdale Lions Club—"B" Company 2–18 Infantry.

First Methodist Church—"D" Transportation 1–4 Cavalry.

City of Graysville—Headquarters Transportation 1–4 Infantry.

Grace Methodist Church—"C" Company 1–2 Infantry.

Hayes Management Association—Headquarters Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Homewood Lions Club—Company "A" 1–16 Infantry.

Huffman Business and Professional Women's Club—4th Platoon "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Independent Presbyterian Church—"A" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Insurance Women of Birmingham—Company "C" 1st Signal Battalion.

Irondale Methodist Church—"A" Company 2–18 Infantry 4th Platoon.

Jefferson County Sheriff's Department—1st Military Police Company.

Jefferson County Medical Society—Company "C" 1st Medical Battalion.

John Carroll High School—2d Platoon "A" Company 2–18 Infantry.

Kiwanis Club of Birmingham—Headquarters Company 1–2d Infantry.

Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668—Headquarters and Service Battery 1–5 Artillery.

Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668—Company "A" 1–2 Infantry.

League of Women Voters—Headquarters Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.

Liberty National Life Insurance Co.—Headquarters Company 1–26 Infantry.

Metropolitan Business & Professional Women—4th Platoon—C Company 1–18th Infantry.

Mountain Brook Jaycees—3d Platoon "A" Company 2–18 Infantry.

Mountain Brooks Lions Club—Headquarter Company 1–16 Infantry.

Mount Carmel Methodist Church—2d Platoon "C" Company 2–28 Infantry.

Mountain Brook Exchange Club—"A" Battery 8–6 Artillery.

Men of the Church, 76th Street Presbyterian Church—"C" Battery 8–6 Artillery.

Nu Ta Sigma Sorority—"A" Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.

Owens Cumberland VFW Post No. 3492—Headquarters Company 1–18 Infantry.

Parisians, Inc.—1–7 Artillery "C" Battery.

Phillips High School—"C" Company 2–16th Infantry.

Pizitz Department Store—Headquarters Company 2–2d Infantry.

Roebuck Business & Professional Women's Club Headquarter Battery 1–7 Artillery.

Ruhama Baptist Church—1st Military Detachment.

Ramsay High School—1st Company "B" Company 2–16th Infantry.

Roebuck Camera Club—Headquarters Battery 8–6 Artillery.

South Avondale Baptist Kindergarten—1st Platoon "C" Company 2–28 Infantry.

Sirote, Permutt, Friend & Friedman—3d Platoon "C" Company 2–28 Infantry.

Sertoma Club East—Headquarters Company High 3d Brigade.

Shades Valley Jaycees—1st Military Police Company.

Shades Valley Kiwanis Club—"C" Battery 2–33 Artillery.

Tarrant Rotary Club—"B" Company 1–26 Infantry.

Temple Emanu-El—"A" Troop 1–4 Cavalry.

United Steel Workers Local No. 1489—3d Platoon "C" Company 1–18 Inc.

University of Alabama Town & Gown Theater—4th Platoon "C" Company 2–28 Infantry.

Woodlawn High School—Company B 1–28 Inc.

Western Birmingham Jaycees—1st Aviation Battalion, "B" Company.

8th Avenue Branch YWCA—Company 1–16 Infantry.

Young Men's Business Club—Company "D" 1st Medical Battalion.

Zonta Club of Birmingham—Company "B" 121 Signal Battalion.

Gadsden has adopted the artillery brigade attached to the Big Red One, and Roadruck Tool Engineering Co. of Guntersville has adopted the 2d Platoon of "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Service of General Wadsworth Outstanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, January 16, 1966, will mark the retirement of Brig. Gen. Louie C. Wadsworth from the National Guard.

With his retirement a chapter closes in Florida National Guard history and his place will be difficult to fill. His has been a record of dedication and service, and I join with his friends throughout the State and Nation in paying tribute to him as he concludes a distinguished military career.

Ceremonies Sunday will see General Wadsworth promoted to Major General and retired.

So closes a career that began when he enlisted in Company E, 154th Infantry, Florida National Guard in Live Oak, Fla., April 18, 1923.

General Wadsworth rose through the ranks, being commissioned a second lieutenant in 1936. He held this rank when called to active duty in November 1940. He served with the 124th Infantry as platoon leader, company commander, battalion executive officer, and battalion commander at Camp Blanding, Fla., and Fort Benning, Ga., in January 1944.

He later served as regimental executive officer and regimental commander of the 3d Student Regiment, the Infantry School.

He served in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater as G–3 with general headquarters, Armed Forces, Pacific, from June 1945 until December of that year.

Released from active duty at Camp Blanding, April 26, 1946, with the rank of colonel, he accepted an Organized Reserve Corps appointment prior to release from active duty, and served in this capacity until named battalion commander, 1st Battalion, 124th Infantry Regiment in grade of lieutenant colonel. He was promoted to colonel and July 29, 1962, was promoted to brigadier general and served as assistant division commander until reorganization in 1963 when he was redesignated as deputy commander of the division, the position which he held upon retiring.

His decorations and awards include the American Defense Service Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Army Forces Reserve Medal and two hourglass devises, Philippine Liberation Medal, Florida Distinguished Service Medal, Florida Service Medal, and Active State Service Ribbon.

In addition to his distinguished military service, General Wadsworth has been an outstanding citizen in his role as publisher of the Suwannee Democrat, respected weekly newspaper in Live Oak.

Under his leadership, the Suwannee Democrat has been cited with most of Florida's major weekly newspaper awards and has been in the forefront of activities which have led to progress for the county and its people.

Born May 30, 1906, in Mayo, Fla., he moved to Live Oak at the age of six and has made his home there since that time with the exception of the time spent in college and the armed services.

The son of the late Charles Randell Wadsworth, Sr., and Mrs. Nellie Wadsworth, he attended Suwannee High School and graduated with the class of 1924. He graduated from Davidson College in North Carolina. After working for a year with the Addressograph Co., he returned to Live Oak in 1931 to become editor of the Suwannee Democrat and has been connected with the paper since, with the exception of the time spent in military service.

He served as president of the National Guard Officers Association in Florida in 1950. He served two terms as president of the Suwannee County Chamber of Commerce, and in 1955 was named Man of the Year in Suwannee County.

Another primary interest in his civic life was his membership on the board of trustees of the Suwannee County Hospital, a position he held many years.

He is a member of the Kiwanis Club and has been active in various other civic groups. He served as lieutenant governor of the Florida district for Kiwanis Clubs.

He served as president of the Rotary Club in 1938 and was president of the junior chamber of commerce in 1940. He served as commander of the Suwannee Post 107, American Legion, in 1951.

One of his continuing interests has been the Suwannee County Fair, serving several times as president. He was one of the founders of the present fair and is the only director left of the original group.

He served as postmaster in Live Oak from July 1947 to September 1948.

In 1956 he served as chairman of a county commission-appointed committee to construct the coliseum building in Live Oak.

The publication of the newspaper and the operation of its plant has been the primary interest and concern of the publisher through the years. Active in the Florida Press Association, he served as president in 1948–49, and served for 11 years as a director of the association.

As publisher of the paper, he has directed the Suwannee Democrat to a position of high regard among the press of Florida.

He also published the Dixie County Advocate in Cross City, the Mayo Free Press in Mayo and the Branford Herald in Branford for a number of years.

The Wadsworths make their home on the corner of 11th Street and Pine Avenue in Live Oak. He is married to the former Miss Clara Staley, and they have two daughters, Mrs. Gayle McCrimon, and Charlotte.

General Wadsworth is a warm, personal friend, and I wanted to take this opportunity to pay tribute to him as he concludes his distinguished service in the National Guard. His shoes will be hard to fill, and I know that he can look back with a great deal of satisfaction and personal pride in the great contributions which he has made.

Bill Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Bill Lee, my administrative assistant, passed away on November 30 of last year as a result of a heart attack. Bill had also worked in the office of Senator Roman Hruska, of Nebraska, and had served as administrative assistant to Congressman Ralph Beermann for 4 years.

Bill was a topnotch newspaperman, highly respected in his profession, and was the recipient of the British Military Medal, second to the Victoria Cross.

Many editorials and newspaper articles were written in Nebraska about Bill Lee, but the one which captured his personality the best was the following story written by Tom Allan of the Omaha World-Herald. I reprint this in the Congressional Record as a salute to Willie.

Another fine tribute to Bill was written by Vern Scofield, secretary of the Nebraska Press Association and it follows the Omaha World-Herald article.

[From the Evening World-Herald, Dec. 1, 1965]

So Long Willie—It Was Foot-to-the-Floorboard With You

(By Tom Allan)

So long, Willie.

I called you Willie because you were something special, a real buddy.

They called you William P. Lee back in Washington where you were an aid to Senator Hruska, Representative Ralph Beermann and, of late, Representative Dave Martin.

Newspaper colleagues and a host of readers and friends knew you as Bill Lee, a go-getting Nebraska newspaperman.

Your salty "On the Lee Side" column in the Ord Quiz won the National Editorial Association's award as the best printed in any weekly newspaper in the United States in 1953.

I knew you as Willie, as lovable a rough-talking orphan, flophouse habitue, guardhouse soldier, war hero, officer baiter, phony-deflator, practical philosopher, astronomer and martini mixer as ever graced the Nebraska scene.

We met in March of 1952 when you were editor of the South Sioux City Dakota County Star and I came up to cover the Missouri River flood.

"Well, where in the hell have you been?" you asked when I walked in. "We've got work to do."

Just like that. Like we'd known each other for years.

Then like the old sergeant you were—between busts for decking a military policeman for slighting the infantry—you started bellowing orders:

"The World-Herald just thinks you are working for them. You are now working for me. So write those stories long, take lots of pictures and make damn sure I get the mats. Unfold that Army cot. You'll sleep here in the shop. I'll supply the booze, the grub and the transportation. So let's go."

Then we took off in his convertible in a snowstorm at 70 miles an hour—with the top down—to cover the flood.

From then until your death this week it was always foot-to-the-floorboard and go-go-go with you when we were together.

The next day we got trapped when the dike broke.

"Don't stand there like the dumb ex-officer you are," Willie snorted. "Save the camera and film. Climb on my back."

Then you waded chest deep across the surging floodwaters protecting your investment—me.

We made radio history that morning. You didn't tell me you were about to broadcast a bulletin on the dike break in a tieup with a Sioux City radio station. I was struggling to get out of a wet pair of Army fatigue pants I'd worn over my regular trousers. Just as the announcer switched to you, my voice calling to your wife came booming over the broadcast:

"Marcella, come help me pull these damn pants off."

You had a contagious zest for life and a real love of people. An unwanted orphan, you had a way of seeing the humor in life's worst kicks in the teeth and the humility to graciously accept the rewards of good living.

Who but you, Willie, when the British wanted to award you their British Military Medal, second to the Victoria Cross, went AWOL from the ceremony and spent your social convalescent leave living it up instead?

The British Ambassador, Lord Halifax, had to mail the medal to you.

Old soldiers everywhere chortled over your advice to Korean rookies in your column:

"Under no consideration act like you have any intelligence. As soon as they find someone who acts like he has a grain of sense, the Army makes a sergeant or corporal out of him. Then you have to spend all of your time running after other soldiers who are smart enough to follow my advice."

But you didn't fool anybody with all that rough talk. I remember you'd get all "melty inside"—that's the way you put it—when you talked of Christmas in the orphanage. When you talked about God those nights, you used layman's words but they had a special dignity and reverence.

How many young journalists did you start on their way? You, the guy in a T-shirt who walked into the office of the Dakota County Star without a lick of training and won a job by selling a full page ad.

I remember your telling me:

"Hell, I was a war hero. It was easy. When the merchants wanted to buy me a drink, I told them: 'Buy an ad instead; I'm learning the newspaper business'."

Washington put a lot of polish on that old hide of yours. But all of us remember you best as the diamond in the rough you were.

So long, Willie. For now.

[From the Nebraska Newspaper, January 1966]

Memo From the Secretary

(By Vern Scofield)

Six friends of Bill Lee took a sad ride together the first part of last month down Dakota Avenue in South Sioux City. The six were honorary pallbearers at Bill's funeral.

Yet, in a way, it wasn't as sad as you might think.

Sacrilegious, the above statement?

I don't think so, because during that ride all six of us were talking about the fun things in Bill's short 57 years on this earth, and we figured that this is the way Bill would have wanted us to be—honest, frank, sincere.

We were all of those. We were talking Bill's language.

Someone mentioned—I guess it was Tom Allan of the World-Herald—that maybe the thoughts which ran through our minds were sacrilegious. But we all knew Bill so well he wouldn't think we were, and it was really Bill whom we were leveling with at the time.

There were many facets to Bill Lee. I suppose the average person, who didn't know Bill like we did, will remember him for his rough language. It shouldn't be that way.

Under that rough language (and Bill was one of the few who could use a dirty word and make it come out like poetry) was a generous and dedicated man.

I guess the thing I'll most remember about Bill was his disgust and rough words about redtape. Bill was a doer, and he cut through redtape any chance he got. He wasn't much of a guy for committees, either. He knew committees are a "way of life," but he would rather "get the thing taken care of" now. He didn't want any part of delay and horsin' around—although Bill didn't use such a parlor word as "horsing."

To many others Bill will be known for his light and humorous columns when he was with the Dakota County Star and later the Ord Quiz. "On the Lee Side" was one of the best, and one year it won NEA's Best Column in the Nation award.

The six of us in that big limousine December 4 talked about the things Bill did. All of us knew some things about Bill Lee the others didn't.

But we all knew Bill as a dedicated newspaperman, maybe the most dedicated the State has known in recent times. And we all knew the kind, rough-spoken Bill Lee who was always for the underdog.

The loss of a friend is great, but the loss of a man like Bill Lee to newspapering can't quite be measured.

"Bill lived 100 years in his 57," one friend said.

To that we agree, and add—he did more for his fellow man in his few short years than most do in 100.

Students Discuss Education and "Dropouts"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, several months ago a very fine weekly newspaper in my district, the Windham County Transcript, published at Danielson, Conn., and in existence since 1848, announced an essay contest for high school and technical school students on the problem of school dropouts and the need for continuing education. When the managing editor of the newspaper, my good friend, Adriaan R. J. Herklots, informed me of the contest and the scholarship awards offered to the winners, I replied that if the views and comments expressed in the winning essays prove to be of general interest I shall be glad to have these essays inserted into the Congressonal Record.

Several weeks ago the winners were finally selected and last week I received clippings of the essays as published in the Transcript. In his letter to me, Editor Herklots states:

> We hope you will find them as educational as we did.

The essays most certainly are educational, and also informative and inspirational. They should serve to encourage our educators to continue their efforts, and they should serve to inspire our youth to continue their education toward the attainment of a vocation or profession. This is a matter which is of vital importance not only to the young people themselves, but to the Nation as a whole.

I wish to extend my congratulations and appreciation to Mr. Herklots and the Windham County Transcript for their campaign against school dropouts and for encouraging young people to continue their education. I am also happy to congratulate the winners of the essay contest for their achievement and their parents for making it possible for these young people to seek higher education. The following are the winners and their essays:

Mark J. Patton, Ellis Tech, First

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *" I want a decent life. Most dropouts end up with cheap jobs with inadequate pay. They are the ones who think school is unimportant, and they say they can get ahead a lot faster if they quit.

There are many reasons that compel a student to drop out. If he is a poor student he feels inferior. He feels no one needs him and teachers neglect him because he is dumb. A student may be bored with school because it is not colorful or rewarding. If he only did his part the rest would come naturally.

Of course, there are some students who are left back. Many of them quit because they think if they couldn't do it the first time why try again.

I intend to finish school because I don't want my friends and relatives to think of me as a quitter which I have mostly been. My marks may be low and all but I like school because I know it will do me good.

There are many jobs open for skilled workers which I will be if I graduate, I hope.

I want to graduate because it is for my own good and the good of my future family.

Phyllis Codding, Killingly High School, Second

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *." I need the growth experiences which school provides. These experiences are vital; without them, I would be more confused and unstable than I am already.

One of the lessons I am learning is self-discipline. Teachers can use time more profitably if I discipline myself, rather than making it necessary to be disciplined. After school, there is no teacher standing over me with a stick, forcing me to study. I must discipline myself to do my homework if I am to succeed.

I am learning to think in wide circles, not excluding the unfamiliar. I am encouraged to explore the unfamiliar that it might become familiar. I am increasing my understanding of the world in general.

I am learning to get along well with others. Since school lasts almost 32 hours a week, it would be quite unpleasant if I did not learn to get along. Life is school on a large scale, and the miseries of discord in life are greatly multiplied in comparison to the scale. It is easier to learn this lesson in school than to learn it the hard way, in life.

Dropout? No; I would rather make my mistakes and learn my lessons now.

Paul Reid, Killingly High School, Tied for Third Place

REQUIEM FOR A DROPOUT

The small white ball bounced haphazardly down the street. Free, at last, to be what the ball really wanted. Get a job—as a baseball, football, maybe a ball bearing.

"No, no, a job here as a pool ball, no, no," echoed the different employers. "We need a guarantee, a piece of paper saying you'll qualify."

Despair set in; the little ball no longer had its high, elusive bounce, but began to slow and barely roll on down its path.

The graying, pudgy ball rolled into the deeply calloused hands of the bombardier. Falling, falling, downward it flew. Waste. The lack of a diploma leading to one fateful mistake increased the deadly speed. Reminiscences? Yes, probably. But was it too late for this remnant of a ball? Definitely. The bomb hit the ground, destroying a city block, for bombs just don't bounce. Such is the destiny of our human tragedy, a dropout.

Linda Stoddard, Killingly High School, Tied for Third Place

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate, because * * *" an education is a giant step toward a better future and will give me a fighting chance to cope with the social and economical problems I will encounter during life. To succeed I need not only ambition but also a sound education.

People yearn to be needed, to be useful, and to belong. They need to be understood, or their lives have no meaning for them. Peace comes through understanding, and understanding comes through learning. An educated person will be able to cope with himself and the world about him.

The high school dropout cripples his chances of obtaining suitable employment and an adequate income in this highly technological age. His lack of education breeds malcontent that might develop into something far more serious.

Every individual reaches a magic point in life when he begins to really come alive and takes a sincere interest in the world around him. Better that this happens in an institution of learning than in any other place.

I want to graduate from high school, because education can help me to open up my potential and can give me needed assurance in my ability for greater achievements.

Marjorie Dickinson, Ellis Tech, Fourth

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *." Let's look this horse of a problem square in the mouth. Setting aside the more obvious side of monetary benefits; examine the personal aspects of dropping out.

Our country didn't get where it is today by dropping out. George Washington didn't say, "I quit," when left with few men and even fewer supplies. Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin didn't give up when the Continental Congress were seemingly hopelessly deadlocked by sectional interests.

Nor did the homesteaders or the minority groups who pushed out our boundaries to the Pacific. The Mormons, one of the most ruthlessly persecuted minorities in history, didn't give up their faith and their beliefs when their homes were burned, farms ravaged and men beaten. No, they screwed up their courage and left behind the thing they loved; because they wouldn't quit.

Anyone can quit. It doesn't take effort to give up on whatever you're doing. But it does take plain old-fashioned guts to stick it out, to make the grades, do the homework and stay with school.

No, our country didn't begin with quitters and get where it is today by quitting. So we owe it to those who struggled before us to keep this country strong—and free. We can only do this by keeping our education and learning ability on top. That is why I will complete my education and stay in school.

ERNEST BESSETTE, PLAINFIELD HIGH, FIFTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *." I was 16 when I graduated from the eighth grade. That was when I realized that an education meant more to me than anything else. In my family not one has completed 8 years of grammar school and 4 years of high. The reason why, was that they had to quit to help support their families. I feel that I have to finish school for my parents. I already have a job at 16 working after school and on Saturdays. But working after school doesn't affect my studies.

It's my handicap that is stopping me. My handicap is going into a class and sitting down and really put my mind to work. If I can overcome this problem, I feel I can go through my 4 years of high and even more. I feel that I am overcoming the problem very nicely. With this accomplishment I know what I want and what I am going to do. I now know I want to finish high and I know now I am going to do it. With the backing of my parents I will go ahead and finish high.

KATHLEEN CHASE, KILLINGLY HIGH SCHOOL, SIXTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *." I am of a low-income family as my father and mother never had the chance to even graduate from grammer school.

My oldest brother was a dropout, but when he entered into the service he took a special course in order to graduate from high school. My other brother stayed back once and in later years received extra help, so he graduated too.

I have stayed back in school twice but I still have faith and trust in God that He will help and guide me in trying to graduate.

Last year I stayed after school almost every night for extra help and I just barely made it in credits for the next year.

Since I'm the only girl in my family I feel that it is my duty to try to the best of my ability and to graduate from high school so that my mother, father, friends, and relatives might someday be proud of me, and that I might have a good, clean job for my reward after I have finished high school.

CHARLES G. HOFFMAN, ELLIS TECH, SEVENTH

"Dropout? Not me. I intend to graduate because * * *." I work after school in a mill making about $1.30 an hour. This would or might be the biggest pay if I drop out. I worked there now for almost 1 year. I work real hard really for nothing. I had a big troublesome matter since I've been working.

I lost my finger. Sure I am not the only one who did but if I would have graduated this might never had happened in my case.

Other people older than myself have no hands, fingers and in some cases legs.

I am minus a finger, and minus a brain, without a diploma, it will all stay the same.

JOSEPH W. WOJCIK, ELLIS TECH SPECIAL AWARD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This valued commentary could not be judged with the other contest entries because of its length.)

I suppose you think I'm going to start this letter off with the same old reasons, which are, better pay, more promising future, self-satisfaction, and for better wants and needs of life. Well, I just did, and what did it prove? Nothing that's what, absolutely nothing. Now I'm going to tell how it really feels to drop out of high school. First of all, you feel very insecure, that is, you don't have a thing to turn to, anything that is half decent anyway. Now then, I'm going to get very frank and down to earth on an excellent example of why you shouldn't leave high school, "Me." I'm the example, I dropped out. I made the big mistake and most of all I asked for it and in a way I wanted to leave school. I actually was a real down to earth troublemaker, and I've got the 34 detentions to prove it. I might as well be honest about the fact that I detested every single day, hour, minute and second. It seemed like all the teachers were against me, and were just waiting for the chance to jump at my throat. I never did homework or hardly ever studied, well I never did to be truthful.

As time went on things began to change; that is, they got worse. Oh, pardon me for giving you a let down. But it did get worse. I got to a point where I was actually scared stiff of the place. I'd have a cold unwelcome air of being unwanted and neglected. Things got so bad I even picked the habit of slang talk and I mean slang. At home I would fight with my folks and in a real sense a 16-year-old brat or Frankenstein.

When I knew I'd never make it through high school, I went to the guidance office to get information on going to the Berklee School of Jazz. I couldn't make it in there because I didn't go far enough in school. Well to be truthful again about the only subject I could really pass was shop. Especially the mechanical drafting. I would get A's and B's. One night at home I thought about myself and that wasn't much to think about. I finally sorted out the things I could do well, play music and draw. Boy sometimes I'd sit outside and draw all day, anything that was in seeing distance. And when it came to music, we'll put it this way, I'd blow that lousy, no good sax till I cried. And sometimes I'd just look at it and cry. Not because I hated it, but because I loved it, it was the closest thing to me I had. Wanting to master that horn is one of the reasons I failed out of school. But I would not let nobody take it from me. It became my only chance to become somebody. I started to play in nightclubs, not at the age of 16 but 15. Some of them were all right but some were as holy as the devil himself. All this kind of work brought me in front of people I even towered over. This gave me the feeling that I still had class and brains, and all that other important sort of stuff. This made me put my thinking cap back on. I thought my other natural talent, drawing. I found that I respected and appreciated a single line as much as a 9/8 time on a sax. I also thought of the future and how secure I wanted it. The horn was OK but not reliable enough. So the drawing was left. I remembered going to the first open house at Ellis Tech. The part that fascinated me most was drafting. All those little lines and figures that were so intricate and detailed. And the idea of knowing that the person who drew them had a heavy responsibility on his shoulders. So immediately I knew what I had to do—beg. Yes, beg, beg, and plead, and ask please. I know I couldn't by all facts be admitted into Ellis Tech, but I had to try.

Well it was this way. I remember being told in high school that I probably wouldn't get past first base in trying to get it. But is was the other way around. I was accepted under a trial basis.

Believe me, if you know what it is like to come to the surface when you're almost dead out of breath in deep water, you probably know how I felt and how relieved I was. It was like morning all over again. But, I couldn't get into drafting. My marks, weren't anywhere near good enough. But I managed to squeeze myself in general construction trades. It was OK but I didn't love it. To do something good you've got to love it and worship it, and I didn't feel that way about GCT. Even though I tried my best, still looking forward to what I really wanted, drafting.

I found the school and teachers different, and every teacher seemed to care, or have a personal part in what I did. I again was relieved. I made it through all the way. I passed all my subjects. I felt more intelligent and more dignified. And held my head up again, which was larger now because my brain grew, and had added additions. Now, I figured I could get into drafting. I knew I had to be at the mercy of my superiors once again. And as last time I pulled through. I am now in architectural drafting and I'm proud of it. I felt a little more superior myself because of the fact that I did what many people told me I couldn't do. I still bawl my head off when I can't get a certain song or run on the sax, and cuss a little when my 2-H lead breaks in the middle of an object line.

But who cares now, I'm half way up that ladder of success. And take my word about dropping out of school, it isn't worth it at all. I came close to being a dropout all the way and when I think about it now it makes me shiver all over. So don't be foolish, stay in school. I was lucky.

Korean Aid in Vietnam—An Earned Dividend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this week we witnessed aid being given by South Korea to the South Vietnamese by the 17,000 troops committed to that country's struggle against communism.

Since their part in this fight for freedom from Communist domination is little known, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 10, 1966:

HERE IS THE RECORD: DIVIDENDS FROM KOREA NATION'S AID IN VIET WAR

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is 13 years since the nightmare of the Korean war. And what did it all mean?

Was it wasted strife or incalculable boon? What is the answer from South Korea today?

The answer is that the American people can be proud of what the United States did for South Korea and has reason to be grateful for what South Korea has done for itself.

This is the record:

With the help of a dozen other nations, but primarily on its own, the United States turned back the aggression to the 38th parallel which divided the two Koreas.

Today, South Korea is secure, tranquil, and progressive.

It has a democratic government ruling by the consent of the governed.

It is carrying forward significant social reforms.

It is stable—so stable that, despite some demonstrations, it was able last year to establish diplomatic relations with its once hated enemy and occupier, Japan, which is now providing it with $800 million in grants and loans over a 10-year period.

South Korea is proving itself resourceful and increasingly self-reliant. It is making steady economic progress and, while U.S. aid has been substantial, the South Koreans have been showing what self-help can really be. Their gross national product has been rising at the rate of about 8 percent a year; industrial production is up 15 percent.

Grievously short of land to enable its people to be self-sufficient in food, the government of Chung Hee Park, by literally carving terraces out of mountains, is doubling its arable land.

South Korean industry is making rapid strides. Exports are up from $20 million in 1959 to $170 million today.

But this is only half of it. These are some of the things South Korea has been doing for itself. These are the ways South Korea has been using its security from aggression.

And now what is the other dividend besides a free people secured from oppression? What is the earned dividend, which has not been asked, but which is now so welcome and so helpful?

South Korea's dividend to the United States is in South Vietnam today.

Defended against Communist aggression by the United States, South Korea is today helping the United States repel the Communist aggression against South Vietnam.

Not just with truck drivers and medical supplies and behind-the-lines support.

But with 15,000 battle-hardened South Korea freedom fighters trained for action in the jungles and rice paddies where the Vietcong are deadliest—plus 2,000 combat engineers.

Little South Korea, with a population of 28 million, is doing far more than any other country except the United States and is contributing more fighting men per capita than even the United States.

And why did the Government and Parliament of South Korea make this tremendous decision to commit 17,000 men to the defense of South Vietnam?

They know from their own experience the crucial need to defeat aggression in South Vietnam—and are doing what they can to help.

Railroads Are of Vital Importance to the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent merger of the Pennsylvania and New York Central Railroads has raised many questions in the areas formerly served by each of these great companies, including the city of Baltimore which I represent.

It is important for us to know how these railroads plan to solve some of the long-range problems of the Eastern States and there have been recent reports which have caused grave concern regarding the future plans of the combined Pennsylvania and New York Central.

However, two recent articles in the Baltimore Sun shed light on these plans and I include them at this point in the RECORD. The statements made by Mr. Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad, at a meeting in Baltimore last Monday indicate that the merger will be of great benefit to the city of Baltimore as well as to our great port, and his statements are reassuring to us.

The articles are as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 11, 1966]

MR. SAUNDERS EXPLAINS

Stuart T. Saunders' statement in Baltimore yesterday was pretty much what the lawyers call a plea in confession and avoidance. Yes, said the president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, he did say the things in a recent speech at Newcastle which seemed to threaten Baltimore railroads with substantial losses of ore and grain traffic. But he misspoke the Pennsy position because he was talking extemporaneously. In avoidance of the impression thus created, he read from a carefully prepared text to make several points including these:

1. When he spoke at Newcastle of diverting freight from railroads, he really meant that railroads could divert freight from other transport modes, having in mind, no doubt, water traffic on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

2. Shippers control shipping destinations in any case, and so select the railroads employed. Those who prefer the port of Baltimore will designate railroads serving that port.

3. The examiners assigned by the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Pennsy-New York Central merger plea concluded the merger will benefit Baltimore. The prospective partners have no new plans. As of now, that is.

4. The ICC examiners specifically underwrote traffic agreements by which the Pennsy and the Pittsburgh and Lake Erie (New York Central) will cooperate with the Western Maryland as a channel to Baltimore. (The Western Maryland has, however, already secured a reopening before the ICC of argument on one point in its relationship with the Pennsy and other reopenings in general would be possible under the law.)

5. The Pennsylvania is planning new investment in the port of Baltimore of some $17 million and—announced for the first time—a Pennsy-Central merger could well require a new tunnel through Baltimore to cost $125 million.

Mr. Saunders did not expand in any degree on Baltimore's special geographical and institutional advantages as against the northern ports. That is for Baltimoreans to do. Mr. Saunders did indicate the obvious—that sound management would require full exploitation of special port advantages by all parties concerned. That is all Baltimore expects and the expectation conditions the support Baltimore interests have given to the Pennsy-Central merger proposals.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 11, 1965]

PENNSY ENDS LONG SILENCE—RAILROAD DISCLOSES PLANS FOR CITY AND PORT

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

For the first time in decades, the Pennsylvania Railroad—through its board chairman—yesterday made public commitments as to what it intends to do for the port and the city of Baltimore.

The pledges were made by Stuart T. Saunders at a public meeting in the board of estimates room yesterday morning. The session was called by Hyman Pressman, city comptroller, after it was disclosed last week that Saunders had stated in New Castle, Pa., that he intended to divert 1 million tons of ore and 15 million bushels of grain annually from the port of Baltimore to Philadelphia.

OFFICIALS PLEASED

After the 90-minute meeting, which Pressman described as "clearing the air," top port officials commented that "this is the first time we've been able to get on the record what the Pennsylvania intends to do in Baltimore. It sounds good."

Among the commitments made by Saunders were:

1. The railroad has a backlog of projects amounting to more than $17 million in store for Baltimore.

2. The board of directors has authorized structural and electrical improvements to the Pennsy's Baltimore coal pier which will permit the handling of 100-ton capacity hopper cars and enable it to handle a greater volume of coal through Baltimore.

3. The Pennsylvania is working out a "mutually satisfactory arrangement for giving Rukert Terminal Corp. all the space it needs in Baltimore in order to continue to develop business."

4. As the new high-speed railway along the eastern corridor between Washington and Boston is developed, the Pennsylvania will invest about $25 million of its own money in upgrading right-of-way and high-level platforms in its Baltimore station.

5. With the city's cooperation, the Pennsylvania is prepared to push studies immediately on developing air rights and other property on the "good many acres" adjacent to the station which could be included in Baltimore's "fine urban redevelopment program."

6. The Pennsylvania grain elevator will continue to be operated as a public grain elevator. The railroad has recently rejected "several very attractive offers for sale or lease" of its elevator.

Saunders did not deny that he had made the statements attributed to him regarding the traffic diversion from Baltimore. Mr. Pressman described the hearing as "clearing the air."

Mr. Pressman said afterward that although he had not intended to make any statement, all of the testimonials in behalf of the proposed merger of the Pennsylvania and the New York Central indicated that it would be beneficial to the port of Baltimore. He also noted that the tone of the hearing was "one-sided" in favor of the railroads.

Saunders admitted that he had made the statements in New Castle, but attempted to ease the concern created by saying he had no idea of getting into a discussion of port situations when he went to New Castle to talk.

Section 14(b) Analyzed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, confusion and deception have clouded the controversy over legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law.

A public service was performed by the Reading, Pa., Eagle in an excellent editorial throwing light on the controversy and on the fundamental issue involved.

This is one of the most important issues in this 2d session of the 89th Congress.

The Eagle is the largest circulation paper in the Sixth Congressional District and one of our State's leading newspapers.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include this informative editorial with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Section 14(b) Analyzed

Repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley labor relations law (the section that allows States to pass so-called "right-to-work" laws) is one of those subjects that commonly engenders considerably more heat than light when it is subjected to discussion.

One illuminating appraisal of the issue has just been offered by New York's Republican Senator Jacob Javits, as published in the New York Journal-American.

"Section 14(b)," he wrote, "is neither the protector of individual freedom nor a restraint on abuses of union power, as is so often argued. On the contrary, this section, which permits individual States to depart from an otherwise uniform national labor policy by outlawing the union shop, is used primarily by southern and a few other nonindustrial States to perpetuate substandard working conditions and thereby attract 'runaway business' from industrial States like New York." (And Pennsylvania, we might add.)

"Opponents of repeal tend to leave the impression that without section 14(b), workers in right-to-work States will be compelled to join unions or lose their jobs. But repeal of this section will compel nothing of the sort. It will permit a company and a union to bargain about the union shop—just as they now bargain about wages and working conditions. * * * If they freely agree upon a union shop, then it is this agreement * * * that controls the situation.

"Even under a union shop agreement compulsory membership is not required in a union: All that is required is the payment of union dues. This unique legal treatment in the case of a union arises from the fact that the union is itself required by law to represent, at its own expense, all employees and not just members.

"While the right-to-work issue often is posed as one of individual freedom, nothing could be farther from the truth. Once the fundamental principle of collective bargaining is accepted, there are literally dozens of instances in which the union—representing the group—may agree on some term or condition of employment which displeases an individual employee. For example, every seniority system gives some employees superior job rights over others and every negotiated wage scale has the effect of prohobiting individuals from bargaining for separate employment contracts on terms conflicting with the collective agreement.

"These are matters which have a far greater economic impact on the individual employee than a clause assessing $5 per month in dues.

"The controversy over 14(b) also has tended to focus public attention on the exercise of union authority throughout the country, and not just in so-called right-to-work States.

"But it is ridiculous to argue that such problems as may arise from the development of union authority in industrial States can be solved by perpetuating depressed wages in Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama and other low-wage right-to-work States where unions never have had much bargaining power."

It needs to be added that Senator Javits endorses repeal of the controversial section 14(b).

A Tired American Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Alan McIntosh of the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn., has summed up in an editorial in that newspaper what many Americans have begun to feel about our society today. We are tired of hearing friends and enemies alike tell us how stupid, greedy, cruel, and ignorant we are.

Stop and think for a moment, if you will, of the last time you read or heard anything good about our country. Would it take a full minute to think of the last time you heard someone describe in great detail what's wrong with America?

Mr. McIntosh's editorial was reprinted in the November 10, 1965, edition of the New York Journal-American and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

A Tired American Speaks Out

(The following editorial, by Alan McIntosh, is reprinted from the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn.)

I am a tired American.

I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American—weary of having American Embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American—weary of being lectured by General de Gaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

I am a tired American—weary of Nasser and all the other blood-sucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the new wave of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than Government relief checks for three generations.

I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched Americans in an obscenity race—who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture—in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage.

I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

I am a tired American—who is angered by the self-righteous breastbeater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes, yet send their own children to private schools.

I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed.

They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the "have nots" achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the "Star-Spangled Banner" and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God, with truly mercy and justice for all.

"The Valley of the Potomac"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the Congressional Record an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington Post of Monday, January 10, 1966, entitled "The Valley of the Potomac" pointing out the needs to preserve in its natural state the magnificent valley of the Potomac for the benefit of all of the people of the Nation and for generations yet to come:

The Valley of the Potomac

The Potomac Interim Report to the President presents eight essential recommendations with most of which there will be widespread agreement by those who see the great watershed as a resource of many values, no one of which they are willing to sacrifice.

There will be especial satisfaction with the flat recommendation that the Seneca dam and reservoir on the main stem of the Potomac not be constructed at this time and the corollary advice that the area be confined to its present economic uses and withheld from intensive development that would preclude water storage purposes later on. There will be differences over the proposal that Bloomington Reservoir's construction go forward at once and even more over the proposal that three added reservoirs be authorized. If they are authorized, no construction irreversibly altering the environment should be initiated until alternative methods of supplying water have been more fully examined. The establishment of a Potomac Valley Historical Park in order to insure a green sheath of recreational land along the Potomac will accomplish most for the areas of most concentrated population, and acquisition should commence there first. The inclusion of the Cacapon in the wild rivers bill is a good idea. Measures of water and soil conservation proposed in the report ought to be hastened by all appropriate action. The George Washington Memorial

Parkway certainly ought to be extended to link Mount Vernon and Yorktown and complete a net of parkways in the river basin.

The search for sources of water alternative to the construction of huge reservoirs with their attendant destruction of recreational lands should be pressed with great energy. The country needs to know the comparative costs and utility of measures such as the Susquehanna diversion, desalination, reclamation and recirculation of waste water and utilization of the upper estuary. The time is past when urban communities could be coerced into vast programs of construction and impoundment on the supposition that the choice lay only between water shortage and reservoir building. But unless there is an energetic pursuit of the alternative sources of water, the President's committee will have made proposals that will only defer and not prevent the eventual resort to large scale impoundment of waters and wholesale flooding of recreational and agricultural lands. The time gained by the temporary measures forestalling any immediate irreversible alteration of the Potomac Basin must be used to assure future water wants of the area.

The great valley of the Potomac like other great river valleys of the country must not be monopolized to meet the water hunger of urban cities arising in great part out of the infamous pollution of streams, the shocking waste of existing water supplies and the utter failure to exploit the gains of science.

United States-Canadian Relations—Address by Congressman Tupper, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, our colleague the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Tupper] is one of the most knowledgeable Americans in the field of United States-Canadian relations. As a member of the United States-Canadian Interparliamentary Group, Mr. Tupper has had frequent and productive contacts with our Canadian neighbors.

Believing that too many Americans take Canada for granted, he led a group of his Republican colleagues, in which I was proud to be included, in the preparation of a white paper on United States-Canadian Relations in which 26 recommendations for U.S. policy were discussed. The white paper has been enthusiastically received throughout Canada and the United States.

On the occasion of the Mapleleaf Dinner in New York City on December 8, Mr. Tupper outlined the white paper and assessed its impact to that point.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Tupper's speech in the Appendix of the Record:

Mapleleaf Dinner Speech by Congressman Tupper, of Maine, New York City, December 8, 1965

The inimitable Art Buchwald, 6 weeks ago, suggested that, if Canadians seriously desired more attention from the United States, you would have to create such a serious problem for us that we could not afford to ignore you any longer. Buchwald suggested you might develop a serious internal Communist threat, or build your own atomic bomb, or demand that the United States give back the St. Lawrence Seaway, or build a Berlin-type wall along the boundary, or burn the American flag at Niagara Falls. But not even Mr. Buchwald's vivid imagination could anticipate the course you chose—to turn out our lights.

I suspect that throughout generations to come, a new cliche will be added to that long list of familiar phrases which are "trotted out" upon the occasion of every speech on United States-Canadian friendship. In the future, our two countries will not only share the world's longest unfortified border, a common language, a common culture, and a common heritage, but a common fuse as well.

On last September 27, nine of my Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives and I issued a detailed white paper on United States-Canadian relations. We listed 26 specific recommendations to the U.S. administration for U.S. policy, covering such areas as education and journalistic exchange programs, U.S. business practices in Canada, trade relations between the two countries, expansion of the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission, problems of water sharing, U.S. immigration policy, and the organization of the U.S. Government to deal with Canadian affairs.

It seems appropriate for me to review with you tonight the reception which this republican effort has achieved over the past 10 weeks. Our efforts received broad editorial endorsement by nearly every major Canadian newspaper. My own office has been flooded with letters of congratulations and appreciation from Canadian citizens—both private and public. And, contrary to the expectations of some skeptics, we were able to achieve the not inconsiderable feat of producing a provocative document on United States-Canadian affairs in the middle of the Canadian election without, at the same time, providing either candidate with an election issue.

While we are, of course, gratified by the favorable reaction in Canada, the document was written primarily to influence Americans and the U.S. administration. While U.S. newspapers have also been generous in their comments, we have not perceptibly budged the administration in its lethargic approach toward United States-Canadian affairs.

The chairmanship of the American section of the International Joint Commission is still vacant, as it has been for the last 477 days.

Canadian relations in the Department of State are still anachronistically conducted under the Office of British Commonwealth and Northern European Affairs.

There are still no plans, of which I am aware, to expand the Fulbright student exchange program to include Canada.

The Merchant-Heeney report of 6 months ago is still merely a skeleton of guiding principles with no meat yet put upon the bones.

The more far-reaching of the Republican proposals of last September will take a long time to consider, to negotiate, and to implement. But the simple steps indicated above could be taken now, by simple direction of the President. And though they are small steps, they could do much to restore to Canadian-American relations a sound basis upon which more progressive measures can be built.

Permit me to pause for a moment to stress the need for a chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission. Throughout the 477-day American vacancy, the corresponding Canadian post has been filled by one of Canada's most outstanding public servants, the Honorable A.D.P. Henney, who on two occasions has been Canadian Ambassador to the United States. His appointment has been a great honor to the United States. By comparison, the long U.S. vacancy is insulting.

Through all the ups and downs of Canadian relations, the IJC has remained a steady bulwark of close international cooperation. Its technical studies prepared the way for international agreements on the St. Lawrence Seaway and the Columbia River Basin projects. Today it is charged with examining the important problems of water pollution and decline in the water level of the Great Lakes. In these and its more routine tasks, the IJC is severely hampered without an American chairman. Most immediately relevant of all, it is the IJC which has the technical capacity, if provided with the appropriate political leadership, to undertake an intensive international study to prevent a recurrence of the frightening power failure of November 9.

My Republican colleagues and I, in a statement on July 23, pleaded with the President to fill the vacancy. We urged him to do so in our September 27 white paper. In a personal letter to the President on October 19, I once more encouraged him to remove this increasingly serious irritant in United States-Canadian relations. Once more on November 9, the day after the Canadian elections and the day of the blackout, I again wrote to the President to urge his action. Perhaps a direct appeal from the officers and directors of the Canadian Society of New York would have a greater influence at the White House. In any event, I encourage you to send one.

One other subject requires special comment and immediate attention. On last September 30, the Congress passed new immigration legislation. I welcomed it and voted for it as a long-overdue change in U.S. immigration policy by removing the obnoxious and discriminatory system of national quotas. The bill, nonetheless, contains a serious flaw—an annual limit of 120,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere that might seriously hinder the flow of immigrants to this country from our contiguous neighbors—from Canada and Mexico. The State of Maine's culture has benefited greatly from immigrants from the Province of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces.

During the fiscal year 1964, 139,284 persons, including spouses and children, emigrated from the Western Hemisphere countries to the United States. Over one-half of these came from our immediate neighbors—38,074 from Canada and 32,967 from Mexico.

If the rate of Western Hemisphere emigration to the United States remains at this level or, as is more likely, increases, and if the bill is administered on a first-come, first-served basis, there is no assurance whatsoever that Canadian and Mexican emigration to the United States will not be affected.

I am sympathetic to the proposition that if regional immigration quotas are assigned to the rest of the world, they should also be assigned to the Western Hemisphere, for there is no inherent difference between these nations and others. There is, however, one vital distinction between Canada and Mexico and all the other nations of the world. They are the only two countries which border directly on the United States—and in my opinion fully free and unlimited immigration between the United States and its immediate neighbors should be maintained.

The bill provides for a study commission to review its potential effects on Western Hemisphere immigration before it goes into effect in June 1968. I hope the study commission will carefully consider the desirability of amending this legislation before that date, to provide for a continuing free flow of immigrants across U.S. borders with Canada and Mexico.

As our September white paper warns, however, "if no limit is placed on immigration from Canada to the United States, the two Governments will nonetheless have to agree on a formula which will prevent citizens from third countries emigrating to Canada, meeting the requirements for Canadian citizenship and then emigrating again to the United States under the quota-free Canadian clause."

It is tempting to dwell here on some of the far-reaching, more provocative proposals of our Republican white paper, and I can assure you that our congressional group in the months to come will spell out in even greater detail the concepts which we have developed for a program of continued water sharing, for an expanded role for the IJC, for further study of how to expand United States-Canadian trade, for a systematic effort to increase student and journalistic exchange. But it may be more important here to stress a portion of that report which has, thus far, received only secondary attention.

We suggested that in addition to all the frequently cited and indisputably correct reasons for closer United States-Canadian ties, there is a new obligation that this highly complex and vulnerable world has imposed upon our two great nations. It is the obligation to set a standard in the conduct of international affairs, to provide a model for relations between independent states. If the United States and Canada cannot establish a model of peaceful and progressive relations, which nations can?

Throughout history, men have grouped together for their common security, for their common prosperity, and for both. The catalyst of unity for some was geography. For some it was religion. And for the last three centuries it has been the nation-state.

Nationalism as a unifying force has provided the impetus for progres. It has produced prosperity out of poverty and order out of chaos. Its virtues are evident.

But the vices of nationalism are no less evident. It has set people against people. It has allowed demagogues to lead by creating a mythical challenge from without. And in a world where man's capacity of destruction seems endless, national unity has become, in a real sense, a source of international disunity and intense peril.

It was misconducted nationalism which throughout the last three centuries fanned the latent embers of human emotion into the flames of war. It is a luxury the world can no longer afford. As the newly independent nations of Africa and Asia set out on the inevitable search for national power and national prestige, we must strive to provide for them a better example than the national history of their elders.

We said in September that the purpose of the efforts of the United States and Canada must be to seek to identify and reemphasize the constructive virtues of the nation-state system while minimising its destructive vices. In the transformation of men and nations, it is necessary to begin where the problems are small—and where the opportunity for progress is great. It is from this perspective that United States-Canadian relations takes on more significance and more promise than relations between any two other countries of the world. It is in this perspective that we share a greater obligation to set aside petty disagreements and differences in order to build on the North American Continent a model of cooperation between independent states which we would see repeated by nations everywhere.

That obligation extends far beyond the two Governments to the peoples of both countries. Its beginning must be found in education about each other. We said in September that there is an appalling ignorance about Canada in the United States, and we suggested that 1966 be designated as "The Year of a New Awareness of Canada." No matter how extensive its interest and dedication, the Government alone cannot create that new awareness, cannot itself forge the foundation of mutual understanding between peoples—an understanding which can allow our two countries to write the first chapter of a new and more noble history of relations between nations.

Therefore, I urge you and organized groups of Canadian citizens which exist in every major city in this country to declare 1966 as your own personal "Year of a New Awareness of Canada" in the United States. I urge the U.S. chambers of commerce, the Rotary, the Lions, the Kiwanis, our political parties, and trade unions, our church groups and educational foundations, the Leagues of Women Voters, and the World Affairs Councils to accept their share of responsibility for building a basis of understanding upon which our two Governments can build a model of international relations.

The challenge and the opportunity are there. The challenge and the opportunity are yours.

New Library Appropriate Tribute to Great Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last month the city of Buffalo, N.Y., dedicated a new library named for a great doctor, statesman, and humanitarian. The Dr. Francis E. Fronczak Memorial Library is a most fitting tribute to this outstanding citizen.

Dr. Fronczak was the health commissioner in Buffalo for 36 years during which time he initiated many new projects and programs for better health service. He was very active in many cultural and professional societies, and served his country by representing the United States under every President from McKinley to Roosevelt at international medical conferences.

Dr. Fronczak served in World War I and was decorated by the United States, Belgium, France, and Poland, receiving their highest military honors. He also represented his fatherland, Poland, at the peace tables of World War I, and as an ex-officio member of Paderewski's Cabinet.

He was rewarded for his service to God and church when he was knighted a Knight of St. Gregory by the Pope.

It is indeed appropriate that this library should be named after this fine gentleman who stood as a pillar of greatness in the fields of medicine, military strategy, public health, literature, church work, statesmanship, and education.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the article written by Mrs. Anne McIlhenney Matthews, which appeared in the December 15 edition of the Buffalo Courier-Express, giving a brief résumé of the dedication ceremony for the Dr. Francis E. Fronczak Memorial Library:

NEW LIBRARY APPROPRIATE TRIBUTE TO GREAT CITIZEN

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

PRIVILEGE

The shadow of a great citizen hung low and lovingly over the shiny brick and steel building at Broadway and Loepere Streets Sunday afternoon. As a new member of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library Board it was a special privilege to attend the dedication of the Dr. Francis E. Fronczak Memorial Library, in this capacity.

As one who knew the late health commissioner over a long period and rather well, it was gratifying to see and hear that so many others also had basked in his friendship and inspiration and were in agreement that his tireless, lifelong devotion to his own special people and his own special city now has continuing recognition and significant commemoration. Dr. Fronczak would have loved it.

UNUSUAL

For one thing, as a ceremony, it was unusual in concept and dispatch. And this latter would have particularly delighted the doctor who had to sit through interminable ceremonies as a head-table luminary and often whispered to this reporter that he envied our "sneaking out the escape hatch."

Councilman Gus Fronczyk and City Court Judge Alois C. Mazur started the dedication within 10 minutes of the planned starting time and ended it on the button.

The chief speaker, Prof. Joseph Wytrwal, of Wayne State University, was supposed to go on last but he went on nearly first and this was great because his message was as special as the event and everyone was fresh at listening and enjoyed it.

He compared Dr. Fronczak with another great doctor, Mme. Curie. There were many there who appropriately learned in a library that she was Polish and that her first great discovery was significantly named "Polonia" and that she insisted that the second, "radium," take its name from the Polish word meaning "humanity" which begins "rad."

Both discoveries she refused to patent insisting that they belonged to the whole world, said Professor Wytrwal.

APPROPRIATE

Fittingly, since Dr. Fronczak had been an ex-officio member of Paderewski's Cabinet, the Paderewski Singing Society under the direction of Michael Slominski, entertained the gathering.

Again, Dr. Fronczak would have loved this. No dirges for him. Like the library itself, the songsters took their theme from Mary Poppins and insisted that everything now is "supercalifragilisticexpialdocious."

Anniversary of Independence of Chad, January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1966, a country formerly part of French Equatorial Africa, but with an area more than twice that of France, celebrated the anniversary of its independence.

That nation, Chad, had been one of the four territories in French Equatorial Africa since 1910. Through a series of progressive steps, which included the dissolution of French Equatorial Africa in 1959, Chad assumed a place among independent nations of the world in 1960.

Little is known of the early history of this landlocked area. At the time of first reports from European travelers in the late 19th century, individual domains were ruled by warring sultans and the territory served primarily as a hunting ground for foreign slave traders.

Today, President Francois Tombalbaye leads the nation under a constitution approved in 1962. President Tombalbaye and his 2.8 million fellow citizens are moving their new nation forward on all fronts—political, social, and economic.

Although Chad has a desert area as large as the State of Texas, it is self-sufficient in food production. National imports reached $34 million and exports $25 million in 1964. The United States is participating in the economic development of Chad with a modest aid program which, since 1962, has averaged some $700,000 annually.

Chad maintains friendly relations with our country and retains close ties with France as a member of the French Community. It has occupied a seat in the United Nations since 1960.

Therefore, it is appropriate that the United States, conscious of its own relative youth, acknowledge and offer congratulations upon the anniversary of independence of a still younger member of the community of nations.

The St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the activities of the St. Lawrence Seaway and all activities by either the Canadian or United States Government or the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, are of great interest to all of the ports on the east coast.

When legislation authorizing the construction of the seaway was enacted by Congress, it clearly stated that tolls were to be high enough to amortize the cost of the seaway over a 50-year period. After that the tolls were to cover the cost of operations. Since that time efforts have been made and are still being made, to reduce or eliminate tolls, to increase the volume of trade through the seaway.

In this connection the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Committee of the North Atlantic Ports Association should be of special interest to the Members and therefore I wish to insert it in the appendix of the RECORD:

SPECIAL REPORT OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY COMMITTEE OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC PORTS ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 1, 1965

It has been customary in recent years for the NAPA St. Lawrence Seaway Committee to prepare a report for the annual meeting in the spring in which the Seaway's performance during the previous operating year and the financial condition of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation is analyzed, along with a description of the committee's activities.

The committee believes it important to file an interim report at this time because, over the coming months, a number of major issues relating to the Seaway will evolve with which members of the association should be acquainted, and in the disposition of which they should take an active part.

By July 1, 1966, the Seaway Corporation and its Canadian counterpart are supposed to recommend to their respective governments a course of action to correct the fact that toll revenues to date have not made it possible for the Seaway to repay its debt to both Federal Governments according to the schedule set up at the time of passage of enabling legislation. That legislation required that the effectiveness of the toll structure was to be reviewed by July 1, 1964, but was postponed for 2 years to the new date. There are indications that the various committees of the Congress will hold hearings on the matter early in 1966, so that the NAPA should be ready, along with other interested organizations, such as the National Committee for a Nonsubsidized Seaway, to present testimony in this connection at that time.

Second, in September of 1965, a special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, released an extensive report on the Seaway which traces its history and its current problems and makes a series of recommendations, practically all of which are inconsistent with the basic theory under which the Seaway was developed. It is most important that considerable attention and publicity be given to correcting the errors of fact and the completely pro-Seaway bias of this report as soon as Congress reconvenes in 1966.

Lastly, the Maritime Administration conducted hearings this year on the essentiality of the Great Lakes overseas routes. The examiner who conducted these hearings reached the conclusion, as did the Senate committee, that something must be done to increase the percentage of total Seaway traffic carried in American ships from its present level of only 4 percent of total Seaway tonnage.

SEAWAY PERFORMANCE IN 1965

Before proceeding to a discussion of the above matters, it might be well to summarize briefly, on the basis of figures to date, the performance of the Seaway during 1965.

In recent years, the total tonnage handled by the Seaway has experienced a significant rate of growth; 1961 represented an increase of 15.3 percent over 1960. Similar figures for the 3 subsequent years were 9.3, 20.9 and 27 percent for 1964 versus 1963. According to preliminary figures through October 1965, the increase for that much of the current season was only 6.5 percent over last year. This obviously represents a substantial drop from last year's 27.2-percent growth.

At the same time it is significant that general cargo shipments through October 1965 increased from 3.1 million tons to 4.7 million tons, an increase of 51.6 percent. Much of this growth is attributable to stockpiling of steel import in anticipation of a steel strike, but increases are noted in other general cargo commodities such as agricultural machinery, vehicles, wines and liquors, etc. The Seaway Corporation has extensively publicized this increase in general cargo, and it should be remembered that the tolls for general cargo are approximately double for those of bulk cargo.

Overall, however, there is no question that the Seaway's 1965 performance represents a definite tapering off from performance in the recent years.

REPORT OF SENATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

A special subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee was appointed in 1963 to make a study of transportation on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and spent almost 2 years on the job, including holding a number of hearings in the East and in various gulf ports. In its final report the committee discusses the background of the Seaway, its current status, and makes recommendations for future activities. However, no testimony by non-Seaway interests, such as that presented by Clifford O'Hara, then president of the North Atlantic Ports Association, is even mentioned in the report.

The committee originally had five members—Senators LAUSCHE, of Ohio, who serves as chairman; HARTKE, of Indiana; HART, of Michigan; PROUTY, of Vermont; Beall, of Maryland. The latter two Senators from the East left the Senate and therefore the committee, at the end of 1964. Thus, the study and report had the benefit of no opposing views but was directly represented by the three Seaway States of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan.

The study was carried, to quote the report, "to review the causes which induced the creation of the Seaway, the results that have developed in the several years of its operations, together with its problems and considered remedies."

Much of the report and its recommendations recall events of the period in the 1950's when we first opposed participation of the Federal Government in deepening and improving the St. Lawrence Seaway and then fought to have it at least established on a self-sustaining basis. At that time various people presented statements to committees of the Congress which expressed opposition to the proposed Seaway, chiefly on two basic grounds: (1) that it was unnecesary from the standpoint of either national defense or benefit to U.S. commerce and navigation; and (2) that while it would impose a stiff burden on U.S. taxpayers, it would at the same time do substantial damage to the livelihood of workers and facilities in many of the Nation's ports, particularly those in the North Atlantic range.

Despite strong opposition from the North Atlantic ports and many other sources, the bill authorizing the Seaway was passed by the Congress and signed by President Eisenhower in 1954. That bill provided Federal funds for the construction of a 27-foot channel between Montreal and Lake Ontario. This was to be accomplished by a new St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation working closely with its Canadian counterpart, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority. Most importantly, the U.S. legislation provided the tolls were to be levied at a high enough level to defray all of the expenses of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, including the amortization of all its debts and obligations within 50 years.

Following passage of the act, the North Atlantic ports immediately turned their attention toward being certain that as the new corporation planned both the physical improvements and its financial structure, it abided by the provisions of the law by which it was created.

For example, in 1957 a spokesman for the NAPA pointed out that during its early years the Seaway would undoubtedly be unable to meet its annual debt service, so that tolls should be established at levels sufficiently high to make up the losses during the early years, as well as to meet the operating costs which were certain to increase with time and as traffic volumes increased. It was also pointed out at that time that further improvement would have to be made if the Seaway turned out to be successful, such as twinning the locks and otherwise increasing its capacity, and suggested that tolls be established at a high enough level to "include the additional capital and operating costs and any others which could reasonably be foreseen."

This history is significant because most of the recommendations contained in the recent report of the Senate subcommittee repeat many of these arguments which were, at least, theoretically disposed of when the legislation was passed, requiring the Seaway to stand on its own two feet in free competition with other ports of the country.

The subcommittee's report reflects the general idea that if the Seaway could be given preference and favored treatment, sufficient tonnage could be generated to make the project self-supporting. Most of the points raised were discussed fully 10 years ago. The present Seaway advocates are apparently trying to forget that many of the same questions were raised by opponents of the Seaway at that time and that the legislation finally adopted made mandatory a self-supporting Seaway.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE REPORT

Following a comparatively accurate accounting of the history of the Seaway and its current operational and financial situation, the committee's report summarizes the problems cited most frequently by witnesses appearing before the subcommittee into five major problems.

1. Failure to achieve a 27-foot depth for all major Great Lakes ports and connecting channels.

2. Scarcity of American ships using the Great Lakes.

3. Discrimination by the railroads against the Lake ports, particularly through section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act by means of inland freight rated discrimination.

4. A wide variety of suggestions for improved operation, greater promotion of the Seaway and the effect of higher tolls.

Recommendations of the subcommittee's report concludes with nine specific recommendations as follows:

1. The report recommends that funds should be appropriated to enable the Army Corps of Engineers to deepen and clear Great Lakes channels and harbors to 27-foot depths.

Although it was not specifically stated, there is an implication that funds for this purpose should receive a special appropriation. If justified on a reasonable basis, there is no reason why ports along the Great Lakes should not be dredged to 27 feet, but they should be required to go through the same procedures as other channels and ports in getting authorization from the Army Engineers and appropriations from Congress in competition with all other requirements for similar port improvements.

2. The report recommends that there should be a program to utilize American ships for Seaway trade.

The report cites many reasons for the fact that only 4 percent of the tonnage on the Great Lakes is carried on American ships, including physical limitations of locks on the Seaway, which is, of course, a built-in handicap, the issue of which was stressed 10 years ago during preliminary discussions of the Seaway. The idea of separating the Great Lakes from the North Atlantic ports in terms of availability of American ships for Government shipments and creation of specific trade route also implies specialized treatment for the Seaway.

3. The report recommends that section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act should be examined objectively and remain unchanged.

The report criticizes Government claims that section 22 saves the Nation as a whole some $50 million per year when it also results in the Seaway being forced to default its obligation of $2 million annually to the Government.

4. The report recommends that the shipping season on the Seaway be lengthened.

The report carefully points out that "an all year open Seaway is not now contemplated," but recommends that the season be extended by 30 days and that future studies should be made as to ways of keeping the Seaway year even longer in the future. In passing it should be noted that the recently passed omnibus bill authorizes a $75,000 study of possible methods of deicing the Seaway.

5. The report recommends studies for Seaway improved lock facilities and for waterways related to the Seaway such as the Champlain Waterway "which would provide for much shorter and direct ocean passage."

The idea of expending further funds to correct deficiencies in the existing locks to provide easier access for vessels by means of an improved Lake Champlain Waterway is recommended, but nowhere is any suggestion made as to how these additional costs could be met.

6. The report recommends that the continuing growth of the Seaway will overtax its present facilities in the next 10 years and that studies should begin for the planning for expansion of locks and other facilities before capacity is reached.

Again the question presents itself as to how such expansion could be justified until the present Seaway is made self-supporting.

7. The report recommends several alternative refinancing methods such as extending the amortization period to 100 years at an interest rate of 2 percent, and which would not begin until the 27-foot depth is available in all major lake ports.

In connection with the financing, the report tries to carry water on both shoulders. In various places it has stated that the growth of Seaway traffic will make it become self-supporting in a few years, but in other places the point is made that in order to be self-supporting, changes should be made in the debt structure. The idea of increasing tolls to make the project self-supporting is dismissed by the committee members as entirely unrealistic because of its alleged effect on future growth on Seaway traffic.

8. The report recommends an expanded program of information and promotion to be carried out by the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

The impropriety of using Federal funds for the promotion of one series of ports at the expense of other ports has been discussed many times before.

9. The report recommends that funds for promotion should come "from tolls alone and not from appropriated moneys."

This provides a variation on the above in an attempt to prove somehow that money collected by the Seaway and not sent to the Federal Government in repayment of debt is somehow less of a Federal subsidy than a direct appropriation.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The NAPA St. Lawrence Seaway Committee therefore recommends that:

1. The committee be authorized to take a prompt and active role in working with such organizations as the National Committee for a Self-Supporting Seaway to create substantial public interest in the question of the Seaway and the importance of the forthcoming decision as to the future tolls structure.

2. The committee be authorized to develop specific testimony to be presented at any hearings by Federal or other agencies and by congressional committees dealing either with the tolls structure or of any of the recommendations developed by the Senate subcommittee.

HAYDEN B. JOHNSON,
Chairman.
PETER SCHAUFFLER,
CHARLES R. SEAL,
EDWARD J. KANE,
GREGORY HALPIN.

The Case Against Declared War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a dangerous trend has begun to develop among certain observers of the Vietnamese conflict. Briefly stated, they are trying to play both sides of the political street concerning the American commitment to the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Their call is "Escalate the war or get out." Their irresponsible appeal is designed to gather political support both on the far left and on the far right. Part of this campaign is the proposal to formally declare war. The Los Angeles Times has effectively stated the case against such an action at this time and its reasoning should be carefully studied by Members of this House.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Nov. 23, 1965]

THE CASE AGAINST DECLARED WAR

A formal declaration of war by Congress would appear, within the context of American history, to carry an implication of finality, of all-out effort, and—in the light of past experiences—of a great moral crusade serving both to unite the country and to foster a sense of implacable determination for seeing through the task at hand.

Perhaps this is why support for such a declaration, against Communist North Vietnam, has recently been voiced by several prominent political figures. Representative GERALD FORD, the House minority leader, was the first, and he has been supported by Representative MELVIN LAIRD, Republican, of Wisconsin.

In view of the many frustrations the Vietnam conflict provides, this attitude may, perhaps, be understandable to some. But this doesn't mean that it is either desirable or practical. For, in the case of North Vietnam, the advantages of a declaration of war are minimal, if indeed they exist at all, while the disadvantages are immense.

Thus far, in fact, no declaration of war advocate has really spelled out what he expects might be gained. Ronald Reagan has suggested that a war declaration would mean the current crop of anti-Vietnam demonstrators could then be treated as law violators. But if ever a case existed of using a cannon to smash a butterfly, this is it.

Both domestically and internationally a declaration of war essentially means a change in legal condition. At home, for example, it might mean invoking sweeping Presidential powers, say in control over the economy.

A state of war with a foreign nation affects economic, political, and cultural relations with that country. But the United States doesn't even recognize North Vietnam. Our only area of contact is on the battlefield. And that contact, needless to say, requires no formal state of war.

The Vietnam conflict can be—is—pursued just as much as may be necessary under present conditions of undeclared war. A declaration, on the other hand, has these disadvantages among others:

It could, as Richard Nixon warned over the weekend, force both Russia and China into open intervention, and possibly lead to nuclear war.

It would ignore the fact that we are legally in Vietnam not as a principal party, but as an invited ally to help the South Vietnamese stop aggression. Nor can we ignore the fact that that aggression, though instigated and strongly supported by North Vietnam, has had and retains some indigenous support. We can't declare war on nameless peasants.

It would raise serious complications with our treaty partners in the Pacific, who, while they are already helping in Vietnam, don't want to face a full-blown war.

And, finally, it would virtually destroy any hope, however thin, for negotiating an end to the conflict. A war declaration is an irrevocable step. Whatever emotional appeal it might have to some, its legal, practical, and military appeals in the present case hardly exist.

A Congressman Goes International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last fall one of our distinguished colleagues, Representative Peter Freylinghuysen, of New Jersey, was honored by an appointment to the U.S. delegation to the 20th General Assembly of the United Nations.

As we expected, Congressman Freylinghuysen served with distinction. In fact, he is credited with a major diplomatic triumph in mediating a dispute on a resolution involving the Palestine refugee program. When the program was threatened with possible extinction due to a dispute between the Israeli and Arab delegations, Congressman Freylinghuysen negotiated a compromise resolution which passed the General Assembly.

His hard work and persistence has been noted by at least two United Nations correspondents. Under unanimous consent, I include in the Congressional Record an article by Louis B. Fleming, which appeared in the Washington Post, and an article by Max Wiener, which appeared in the Newark Sunday News:

[From the Washington Post]

A Congressman Goes International

(By Louis B. Fleming, of the Los Angeles Times)

United Nations.—A Congressman turned diplomat in order to rescue the Palestine refugee program from a political disaster and possible extinction in the United Nations General Assembly.

Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Republican of New Jersey, one of the two Members of Congress serving on the U.S. delegation to the 20th General Assembly, has won widespread praise from delegates for his work on the delicate problem.

The solution involved not only strenuous corridor negotiations but some extraordinary Assembly procedure. The final compromise, which made just about everybody happy, emerged from an earlier unexpected defeat for the United States, which has a deep humanitarian and a ticklish political stake in the question of the Palestine refugees.

As the country which has put up 70 percent of the cash, the United States has been anxious to fulfill humanitarian needs without frustrating progress toward a compromise that would permit the 1.2 million refugees to live normal, useful lives.

As a supporter of Israel as well as a country seeking influences with the Arab nations, the United States has sought to appear nonpartisan and has fought for even-handed resolutions in the General Assembly. This year, the United States lost. Israel amendments were resisted. But Arab amendments, sponsored by Pakistan and Somalia, were adopted by the razor edge of 43 to 39, with 23 abstentions.

Adoption of the Arab amendments to a resolution introduced by the United States forced the American delegation into the peculiar position of voting against its own resolution, which had suddenly come to include what amounted to an endorsement of Arab military action against Israel as well as a liberalization of the relief rolls that would have compounded the already overtaxed and deficit-ridden U.N. budget.

Most of the big cash donors to the program joined the United States in not supporting the amended resolution as it finally cleared the Assembly's special political committee. Usually, a committee report is adopted by the Assembly unchanged, and the vote is about the same because the committees include every U.N. member. But in this case, a final vote in the Assembly, with the United States and the other cash contributors all voting no, would have jeopardized the future of the relief program.

So Frelinghuysen went into action. For 3½ weeks, he negotiated a new draft. Day after day, he met in the corridors and committee rooms with the delegates of the Arab neighbors of Israel, with the Israelis and with Ambassador Adnan Pachachi of Iraq, who coordinated negotiations for the Arabs.

There was one thing that helped Frelinghuysen. The Arabs were as anxious as anyone else to keep the relief program alive. And they realized the danger to the future of the program if the donors found the resolution unacceptable because of the Arab amendment.

An acceptable compromise resolution finally emerged. All groups agreed to draft a new resolution and give it priority in the voting so that the unacceptably amended resolution would die. Nigeria, which had been neutral, agreed to sponsor the new resolution. It passed the Assembly by a vote of 19 to 1, with 7 abstentions. Israel cast the negative vote because of disagreement with the indirect references to repatriation of the Arabs who fled Israel during the fighting in the late 1940's.

Dark as the picture may be, it would have been darker, if not hopeless, had not the new resolution won approval.

"The closest I have ever come to something like this in Congres was negotiating the conference bill on foreign aid last summer," Frelinghuysen said.

He found the U.N. approach curious. The committee working on the refugee problem was preoccupied with the choice of words, "much more concerned than we are in Washington when we write a bill," he said.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, Oct. 3, 1965]

Frelinghuysen Labors for President at U.N.

(By Max Wiener, News U.N. correspondent)

United Nations, N.Y.—Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Republican, of New Jersey's Fifth Congressional District, is working here temporarily for the Democratic administration's executive branch—and finding it an intensive, arduous and fascinating experience.

There is nothing novel about this switch—from legislative to executive-diplomatic work. Every year, two Members of Congress—one Democrat and one Republican—are selected as members of the U.S. delegation at the United Nations for the annual session of the General Assembly.

This year the two are members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Next year it will be the turn of members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Frelinghuysen's committee colleague and temporary codiplomat at this session is Representative Barratt O'Hara, Illinois Democrat.

Up to now, Frelinghuysen's main official contact with State Department diplomats has been to listen to them testify before his House committee. Now he's rubbing shoulders with them as a diplomat, "a member of Ambassador Goldberg's team," as he puts it, working to carry out the Democratic administration's policies at the world organization—at least while the Assembly lasts.

WORKING 11-HOUR DAYS

The Congressman is putting in an 11-hour day here at briefings, consultations, Assembly and the Committee of the Whole meetings, and at working lunches, dinners, and receptions. He is finding out at first hand, he says, how U.S. diplomats work and is also having the new experience of personal contacts and exchanges of views with foreign delegates.

And he disagrees with Representative Wayne Hays, Ohio Democrat, who said he wouldn't act as a Charlie McCarthy to Ambassador Goldberg's Edgar Bergen. Frelinghuysen feels it is a rewarding and patriotic assignment to represent his country at the world organization.

"You get new insight into U.N. problems up here," he said. "You're not at all a mere bystander. The demands on my time are far greater than in Washington."

His main job is to represent the United States on the fifth, or budgetary committee. A second important assignment is to the Special Political Committee. On both, he finds himself dealing with the crucial problem of how the U.N. can bail itself out of its huge debt—largely caused by refusal of Russia and France to pay for peacekeeping operations—and what to do in the future about peacekeeping and its financing.

As a legislator who took an active interest in the U.N. bond issue which Congress approved to help the world organization, Frelinghuysen finds it fascinating to hear the Soviets objecting to the U.N. paying off even interest charges on the ground that the peacekeping debt was imposed by the Assembly instead of the Security Council, and is therefore illegal.

NEW INSIGHT

His Foreign Affairs Committee some time ago approved cutting $1,800,000 from the U.S. contribution to the care of 1 million Palestinian refugees. This was designed to put pressure on the Arabs to agree to some permanent solution, instead of Arab insistence year after year that the only solution is for Israel to take all the refugees back.

Now in the special political committee, Frelinghuysen is discovering at firsthand the sentiments of the Arab delegates and of the representatives of other countries.

"I'm going to enjoy this all very much," he said. "In fact, I am enjoying it immensely already. It's an experience for me to have an Iron Curtain ambassador or one from an uncommitted African country seek me out at a reception for some informal discussion of difficult problems. I couldn't get the same insight any other way."

Obviously, his remarks as a diplomat pro-tem must be somewhat more diplomatic than they were when he was a freewheeling legislator.

Thus, while wearing only his congressional hat, **Frelinghuysen** voiced some definite and not altogether approving views after Goldberg, in his maiden U.N. speech in August, announced the United States was no longer insisting that Russian and France lose their assembly votes if they didn't pay their past peacekeeping assessments.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell B., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4828 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Vacancy

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Medicare Planning Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT T. SECREST

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, January 7, 1966:

MEDICARE PLANNING ESSENTIAL

A new year brings new problems, and 1966 is no exception. One of the biggest problems— a whole nest of problems, in fact—will come with the implementation of the Federal medicare program.

With the program starting July 1, we have less than 6 months in which to prepare, and that means everyone concerned with putting the program into action should be starting now to plan for it.

The program will be so immense, and will take us into so many unexplored areas of caring for the elderly sick that we can expect new and unanticipated problems will be cropping up when the program actually is underway. But there are many other factors that are already fairly certain, and for which we should be preparing in the next few months.

It seems certain there is going to be increased use of hosptital beds, a need for more doctor and nurse services, an increased demand for all of the services a hospital supplies—food, laundry, therapy, laboratory, rehabilitation. It is also generally expected there will be a great increase in need for nursing home facilities.

Some of the problems of medicare can be tackled in Washington, but the overall success or failure of the program can quite well hinge on how well it is handled in the communities.

Doctors will have an extremely important role in the program, and the degree of care and restraint which they exercise in sending patients to hospitals or nursing homes may well make or break the program.

Hospitals also face a great responsibility in seeing that facilities are used to the best possible advantage for the public interest as well as for the interests of patients. Competition among hospitals, resulting in costly duplication of services or even more costly idle facilities and personnel, can result in astronomical costs, not only for the medicare program itself but for the groups owning or supporting the hospitals. Nursing homes may face similar problems.

Finally, the success or failure of the program can lie largely with the public. Efforts to use the medicare program as a source of unnecessary care or as a means of getting rid of unwanted elderly members of the family could make it prohibitively expensive.

Even before the program starts, it looks as though cooperative and coordinated community planning is going to be essential if we are to make the best possible use of the doctors, nurses, hospitals, and nursing homes.

Medicare can be a boon to the Nation, but only if communities do their best to make it work successfully.

We in Knox County are fortunate in having more hospital and medical facilities than many communities have, but we can be caught short unless we start planning now to make the best possible use of them.

Law and Order

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the San Jacinto District Board of the Texas Federation of Women's Clubs request that I call to the attention of the Congress a resolution adopted at a recent meeting pledging their support to law and order in the United States.

A newspaper article from the El Campo Citizen, El Campo, Tex., Tuesday, October 26, 1965, concerning this action follows:

WOMENS CLUB VOTE FOR LAW AND ORDER

At the San Jacinto District of Texas Federation of Womens Clubs board meeting held in Bay City, October 21, a resolution was passed unanimously to support the U.S. Government in the "enforcement of law and order to stamp out the seditious ugliness that is growing in America from lawless demonstrations, marches, and riots."

This womens federation district covers 15 counties, including the cities of Galveston, Houston, Brazoria, Palacios, El Campo, Victoria, Yoakum, College Station, and all within this area. It involves 63 womens clubs with over 1,500 members. In El Campo members clubs are Sorosis and the Sesame. Club members who attended the district board meeting from El Campo were Mrs. Fred Melcher, Mrs. C. T. Boyle, Mrs. P. H. Longwood, Mrs. A. J. Issacson, Mrs. W. E. Ferguson, Mrs. Paul Lampley, and Mrs. M. L. Hansard.

The resolution reads: "The members of the San Jacinto District, Texas Federation of Womens Clubs in session October 21, 1965, deplore the ugly image that is being presented to the world by lawless demonstrations, marches, and riots. This is indicative of the lack of patriotism and devotion to our country. As loyal Americans we wish to impress upon our Representatives in Washington our desire to firmly stand behind them in their enforcement of law and order. We cannot stress too strongly the need for stamping out this seditious ugliness that is growing in the United States of America. We strongly urge investigation of this communistically inspired attack that is growing more vicious each day. We ask that the Texas Federation of Womens Clubs and the General Federation of Womens Clubs take similar action in demanding enforcement of law and order as presented by this resolution.

"Signed by Mrs. George P. Kelley, trustee, San Jacinto District TFWC; Mrs. Paul Lampley, national legislation chairwoman; Mrs. Ralph Morgan, resolution chairwoman."

Copies are to be sent to President Johnson, U.S. Congressmen, and Governor Connally.

Representative Pelly Calls for a Full Congressional Debate on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives, as the 2d session of the 89th Congress convenes, look forward to fulfilling our legislative responsibilities to the American people. It will require great patience, wisdom, and dedicated service to preserve and protect our Republic from enemies, both domestic and foreign, as under our oaths of office we are sworn to do.

Clearly, Vietnam is the No. 1 problem before the Nation. It will be the major question before the Congress this year.

Already, Mr. Speaker, I have had a number of private conversations with individual members of committees having jurisdiction over foreign affairs and defense. During the recess, these colleagues have been looking into the war in Vietnam and our military situation.

I have asked a question of one of our colleagues, who, as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, has been briefed recently by officials of the Department of State. My question was one I was frequently asked last fall by constituents; namely, why the conduct of the war and the policies we are pursuing is not a fit matter for congressional debate. In answer, I was informed that a high-ranking official of the State Department had told the House committee, in executive session, that the administration was "almost of a mind to allow such a debate." What a shocking statement. Imagine the implication that the Congress of the United States can only debate such an issue if the Department of State so approves. Certainly, such an implication impugns the independence of this great legislative body.

Personally, Mr. Speaker—and as one who have supported the President—I strongly favor a full and open discussion of the southeast Asia situation, and consideration by the Congress—as provided under the Constitution—as to a declaration of war on North Vietnam.

In this connection, I frankly doubt if the American people are being given the facts. For example, Secretary McNamara has said that the United States has stopped losing the war, but my conversations with Members who have recently visited Vietnam and studied the situation lead me to believe that, on the contrary, in the overall picture this may well not be true.

Of course, the latest peace promotion has been gratifying to the American public and has no doubt somewhat improved the unfavorable world image that has hurt our cause in the past.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that alternatives should be known. I refer to the fact that accelerating the war by bombing Hanoi or major facilities and industries is not the only course before us. Nor is a tight blockade our only course. I am informed that all the United States has to do is to bomb North Vietnamese dikes and that country will be flooded and rendered economically helpless. The resulting floods, I am told, would completely disrupt the war efforts of the North Vietnamese.

Mr. Speaker, with more American lives being lost every day and with general lack of public knowledge as to our policies—except that we will talk peace anywhere, at any time, and with no conditions—I favor opening up the subject of Vietnam for full and free discussion by the Congress. Only on that basis can the country make the proper decisions and provide the right answers to this unhappy issue.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, at home, the people are raising questions about the war. Who will say that they are not entitled to the facts?

Certainly, these facts, and the full and complete picture, were not included in President Johnson's state of the Union message.

The scheduled briefing of Members of Congress by Secretary of State Dean Rusk, in an off-the-record session, is all to the good. But the imposition of secrecy only serves to confuse the issue publicly. What is needed is a full debate, with all questions and answers on the record. Under our system of government, the public should not be kept in the dark.

As in the past, I will try to dig out what facts I can, and always refrain from partisan criticism. But, unless frank and full answers to the questions which my constitutents raise are forthcoming, I will feel impelled to protest and point up any such failures.

Mr. Speaker, other than this, the Democrats in the administration and in this House of Representatives can count on my support of a bipartisan foreign policy. But, as I have said, I must have the facts and I must know more about just what is our foreign policy.

Hour of Decision on Vietnam Near

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that David Lawrence's article entitled "Hour of Decision on Vietnam Near" appeared the same evening as the President's state of the Union message but I found nothing in the President's message that would indicate a decision actually has been made or is contemplated. The status quo seems to be the only solution recommended by the administration. David Lawrence's article follows:

Hour of Decision on Vietnam Near

(By David Lawrence)

Nobody likes to see his country engaged in a war. As the lives of young men are sacrificed daily, the questions asked again and again are whether the Vietnam war is really necessary, whether it is America's responsibility alone, and whether the shedding of blood in defense of idealism—often vaguely expressed—is truly worthwhile.

Today in the National Capital, as Members of Congress who have been to Vietnam bring back discouraging descriptions of the jungle warfare and how hard it will be to win a victory, a certain skepticism concerning America's mission emerges. The people of the United States also may well express doubts, because neither the underlying issues nor the policy being followed by the President in limiting military operations has been fully explained.

It's one thing to fight a war with maximum power, and it is another to carry on a war with limitations placed on the use of full military force. Perhaps the best explanation of what is really going on came in a little-noticed speech delivered in Detroit on December 6 by Gen. John P. McConnell, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, after a trip to Vietnam. He said air strikes are designed to impede the flow of supplies and reinforcements being sent into South Vietnam from the north, and to make it "too costly" for the North Vietnamese to continue this support. He added:

"This strategy, which is best described as 'strategic persuasion,' gives the President a highly flexible tool in inducing North Vietnam eventually to accept his offer of unconditional discussions.

"It is true that we could achieve this objective, virtually overnight, by destroying North Vietnam and forcing its surrender. We certainly have the military capabiltiy to do so. But President Johnson has emphasized that it is our national policy to keep this conflict at the lowest possible level of intensity, for humanitarian as well as for political reasons.

"As both our Commander in Chief and head of our Government, he has the final decision on the exact level and scope of our bombing effort in North Vietnam, and that decision must be guided not only by military considerations and recommendations but by many other and possibly more compelling factors."

These words, carefully chosen, say, in effect, that the United States at present isn't fighting the war to win. This means that American boys are losing their lives in a strategic game which may or may not prevent a larger war.

But will temporizing with the enemy achieve peace, or will it bring on the big war anyway? There is only one valid reason for the sacrifice of American lives in Vietnam today. It is to save millions of Americans from being killed or wounded later in the enlarged war that can come if the Communist governments in Moscow and Peiping are not thwarted in their ambition to take over control of small as well as large nations in Asia, Africa, and the Western Hemisphere.

Red China, meanwhile, is accumulating nuclear weapons. Based on past experience, recklessness in the expenditure of human life can be expected from Peiping. The realistic truth is that the United States is powerful enough today to win in Vietnam. It can demonstrate by a single example of unlimited bombing that any risk necessary will be taken. This would simply be a recognition that the war of aggression in southeast Asia could be the forerunner of a direct attack someday on the American people by an irresponsible government possessing nuclear weapons.

Members of Congress are divided in their opinions, and for the most part are willing to let the President decide the policy that should be followed. Others think public discussion could be helpful. Here are some simple points involved: Is anything ever accomplished by procrastination in a military dilemma? If the United States gives the impression it is afraid to risk maximum force, doesn't this tell the enemy that it can continue the war indefinitely?

Maybe what is needed is a single example of heavy bombardment of North Vietnam and a threat to inflict similar blows unless the enemy agrees to go to the conference table to discuss a settlement. Certainly any manifestation of timidity will be misconstrued. So it becomes clear that the hour of decision on how to fight the Vietnam war draws near.

Resolution Adopted by the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of this House a resolution adopted by the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers, on November 15, 1965.

I hope the message comes through loud and clear. The American labor movement is beginning to suspect the Democratic Party of insincerity and foot dragging. Labor is beginning to realize that the Democrats want to milk and use organized labor rather than help achieve labor's goals. This partnership is a one-way street—labor produces and the Democrats profit.

The Democrats do not want to offend other groups by passing labor's legislative package—which labor has paid them well to support. No, the Democrats are trying to trick labor in this election year by selling them out on labor legislation and trying to blame the Republicans. Labor knows better.

The resolution follows:

Resolution Adopted and Approved by the General Executive Board of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators & Paperhangers of America, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C., November 15, 1965

Never before the general elections of 1964 has organized labor succeeded in demonstrating their political strength so effectively. It was widely proclaimed that the labor movement was directly responsible for the election of more than 50 Members of the Congress from marginal districts. The campaigns to register voters as well as the drive to get out the voters on election day was highly successful. Labor's full-fledged political activities in 1964 were accelerated by the fact that the Democratic platform as well as the Democratic nominees' outright pledges included the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and the enactment of situs picketing legislation, and

Whereas the general executive board has carefully reviewed the events which culminated in the miserable failure of the U.S. Senate to enact the 14(b) repealer and the situs picketing measure; and

Whereas the general executive board is of the opinion that neither the Chief Executive nor the Senate majority leader accorded the repeal of 14(b) with anything like the same degree of urgency as was accorded the long list of bills dealing with social legislation, all of which were vigorously and fully supported by organized labor; and

Whereas our brotherhood, including all of the affiliated district councils and local unions, worked tirelessly during the elections and during the session of Congress for enactment of 14(b) and situs picketing to no avail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the brotherhood and all of the members throughout the Nation will dedicate themselves to call upon the Members of the U.S. Senate to make repeal of 14(b) the first order of business upon convening in January 1966; and further be it

Resolved, That all Members of the House of Representatives shall be urged by district councils and local unions as well as individual members of the brotherhood to enact the situs picketing measure H.R. 6363; and finally be it

Resolved, That the brotherhood shall send this resolution to the Congress and to the White House and publish it in the official journal of the international union.

Housing Cutback Is Indefensible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, our dedicated military men continue to valiantly uphold American traditions and protect freedom around the world even though the Great Society is treating them like stepchildren. To illustrate the point, I ask my colleagues to read the following article borrowed from the Army, Navy, Air Force Journal on January 1, entitled "Housing Cutback Is Indefensible":

HOUSING CUTBACK IS INDEFENSIBLE

Secretary of Defense McNamara's "difficult" decision to defer construction of military family housing, BOQ's, barracks and hospitals authorized and funded by Congress for fiscal 1966, is typical of the many "penny-wise, pound foolish" actions with which career military personnel have been confronted since the close of World War II.

No single program has been relegated more frequently to the role of Cinderella than family housing.

Over the past 20 years, the Armed Forces have had to make-do with just about every temporizing housing expedient anyone could dream up.

Families have had to create "homes" in shacks, Quonset huts, Lanham Act chicken coops, inadequate, and sparsely constructed Wherry Act dwellings, off-base Capehart Act houses (most of which, when the services were forced to purchase them, had to be overhauled to meet Government standards), and a great variety and number of substandard housing units better fit for kindling than human habitation.

The housing situation has been so critical that Secretary McNamara, himself, pasted an urgent label on the appropriated-funds construction of thousands of new units. When he told Congress last year that he would absorb a cut anywhere else in the construction program in order to obtain funds for housing, the Secretary forcefully underscored the serious morale implications of the housing problem.

If Congress had given the Secretary all that he asked for, the services would still be lagging on the housing front. But, as every career member of the Armed Forces knows, the Senate chopped millions of dollars from the program.

Now, construction of the smaller number of housing units that remained has been indefinitely postponed, and there is good reason to believe (The Journal, December 18) that no new housing will be included in the budget to be presented to Congress this month.

The action—regardless of the mounting costs of supporting the war in Vietnam—is impossible to reconcile with Secretary McNamara's previous stand. If the services required the housing on an urgent basis just a few months ago, the urgency is not dispelled by the war.

Secretary McNamara says the deferred family housing projects "although necessary and desirable, can be undertaken at a later date without impairing military operations or effectiveness."

The nonsense of this statement is all too apparent. It is obvious that the Secretary is merely trying to put the best face on an awkward situation in which he has either decided or been told to cut costs whether he deems them wise or not.

He must know, as others do, that morale has an enormous impact on military operations and effectiveness, and that the housing cutback is as damaging a blow to morale as any action that could have been taken.

Surely, members of the Armed Forces should not have to fight the war in Vietnam, suffer the privations and discomforts of the war, be crippled, or die in combat, and have to pay for the privilege by giving up decent living quarters for their families.

Congress should demand that the housing be built.

Stop Highway Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States last night in his state of the Union message announced he will recommend to this session of Congress legislation to arrest destruction of life and property on our highways.

The President said he would propose a Highway Safety Act of 1966 to seek an end to this mounting tragedy.

I think the President should be reassured that millions of American citizens share his dismay at the continuing carnage and destruction on our Nation's highways.

One of the most articulate expressions of this concern to come to my attention is recent comment by Rabbi Maurice Davis of the Indianapolis Hebrew Congregation.

Writing in the latest issue of the Temple Bulletin in his regular "From Where I Sit" column, Rabbi Davis declared, "There is something wrong with a society that can mobilize wealth, intellect, energy, ingenuity to launch astronaut after astronaut without mishap, and still be unable to stop the wanton slaughter on our roads."

Because of the timeliness and effectiveness of this message by Rabbi Davis, I take this opportunity to include his statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STOP HIGHWAY SLAUGHTER

"Everyone loves a winner." We have been taught this with such intensity, and we are so in love with "coming in first" that we subconsciously carry it over into areas of sheer horror.

Take for example our latest achievement. We have established a new record for killing people with automobiles. We knew it was coming. One radio newsman said a few weeks ago, "We are in striking distance of breaking the 1941 record."

Congratulations. We made it. The year 1965 now takes the place of 1941 as the year of the greatest slaughter on our streets. In 1941 we killed 1,478 people, and after all that's barely more than 4 a day, or 28 a week, or 123 a month.

There is no form of accidental death that can remotely approach this carnage, and the worst is still ahead. I am terrified by the knowledge that members of our congregation are going to die of automobiles in 1966, and we who speak about the sanctity of life are silent in the face of avoidable tragedy.

There is something wrong with a society that can mobilize wealth, intellect, energy, ingenuity to launch astronaut after astronaut without mishap, and still be unable to stop the wanton slaughter on our roads.

There is something wrong with a society that was able in the last recorded year to reduce the number of deaths by poliomyelitis to 48, while 43,600 people died of automobiles. It is time to bring this scandal out into the open. The blame cannot rest entirely with the driver, or traffic enforcement, or highway planning. It is time to talk bluntly to the automobile industry.

Too many people are dying of automobiles, and I refuse to believe that nothing can be done. It is time for the automotive industry to do more than sell cars. It is time for them to share the responsibility for what happens after the cars are sold.

It is time to pressure Congress to pressure the industry. Our task is to drive carefully and defensively, but our task is more than that. Our task, also, is to complain loudly, and to the right people.

Write a letter today to BIRCH BAYH, or VANCE HARTKE, or ANDY JACOBS, or any of the men who represent us. Tell them we broke the record, and we are ashamed, and we are angry, and we need help.

If you don't feel like writing, then tear out this column, and send it to one of them.

Money Income for War Veterans and Their Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from a recent release of the Veterans' Administration on the income of war veterans and their families:

TABLE 3.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veteran husband-wife families (wife with earnings) in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years			65 to 69 years	70 years and over				
						Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years		Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72 years	73 to 74 years	
Number (thousands)	7,253	1,054	3,236	2,220	324	[1] 80	[1] 39	[1] 41	192	147	119	[1] 90	[1] 29	[1] 28
Percent, by age	100.0	14.5	44.6	30.6	4.5	1.1	0.5	0.6	2.7	2.0	1.6	1.2	0.4	0.4
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	--------	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	--------	--------
Under $500	.2	(2)	.1	.1	1.0	--------	--------	--------	(2)	4.9	4.6	--------	--------	--------
$500 to $999	.3	(2)	.3	.4	.7	--------	--------	--------	(2)	(2)	(2)	--------	--------	--------
$1,000 to $1,499	.5	.5	.7	.3	(2)	--------	--------	--------	1.2	(2)	(2)	--------	--------	--------
$1,500 to $1,999	.6	.3	.8	.6	(2)	--------	--------	--------	.6	(2)	(2)	--------	--------	--------
$2,000 to $2,499	.9	.8	.6	.7	1.4	--------	--------	--------	4.1	5.6	5.5	--------	--------	--------
$2,500 to $2,999	1.5	2.7	.9	.3	1.7	--------	--------	--------	10.0	13.9	16.5	--------	--------	--------
$3,000 to $3,499	1.6	2.0	1.0	1.6	3.0	--------	--------	--------	4.1	3.5	1.8	--------	--------	--------
$3,500 to $3,999	1.9	1.6	2.3	1.1	2.4	--------	--------	--------	5.3	2.8	(2)	--------	--------	--------
$4,000 to $4,499	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.0	1.7	--------	--------	--------	4.1	3.5	4.6	--------	--------	--------
$4,500 to $4,999	2.4	2.1	2.3	2.4	1.7	--------	--------	--------	2.4	8.4	4.6	--------	--------	--------
$5,000 to $5,499	3.7	5.2	3.5	3.4	3.0	--------	--------	--------	8.8	1.4	1.8	--------	--------	--------
$5,500 to $5,999	3.7	4.0	3.7	2.7	5.7	--------	--------	--------	5.9	4.9	4.6	--------	--------	--------
$6,000 to $6,499	5.2	4.2	5.8	4.5	4.7	--------	--------	--------	5.3	9.8	11.0	--------	--------	--------
$6,500 to $6,999	4.6	7.0	4.8	3.3	3.0	--------	--------	--------	5.3	7.7	8.3	--------	--------	--------
$7,000 to $7,999	11.2	14.9	10.0	11.6	8.8	--------	--------	--------	12.3	9.8	10.1	--------	--------	--------
$8,000 to $8,999	10.6	11.4	11.2	10.6	6.4	--------	--------	--------	4.1	7.0	9.2	--------	--------	--------
$9,000 to $9,999	9.9	13.6	9.1	10.9	8.8	--------	--------	--------	1.2	1.4	1.8	--------	--------	--------
$10,000 to $11,999	17.0	16.2	18.4	17.6	16.2	--------	--------	--------	8.2	4.2	2.7	--------	--------	--------
$12,000 to $14,999	13.6	7.3	15.3	14.3	20.3	--------	--------	--------	8.8	6.3	8.3	--------	--------	--------
$15,000 to $24,999	7.3	4.1	6.4	10.0	7.1	--------	--------	--------	5.9	4.9	4.6	--------	--------	--------
$25,000 and over	1.1	.3	.7	1.6	2.4	--------	--------	--------	2.4	(2)	(2)	--------	--------	--------
Median [3]	$8,890	$8,270	$8,990	$9,390	$9,560	--------	--------	--------	$6,340	$6,070	$6,290	--------	--------	--------

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

TABLE 4.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veteran husband-wife families (wife with no earnings) in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	60 to 64 years			65 to 69 years	70 years and over				
						Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years		Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72	73 to 74	
Number (thousands)	10,292	1,626	4,499	2,332	402	149	[1] 42	107	672	612	492	356	136	120
Percent, by age	100.0	15.8	43.7	22.7	3.9	1.4	0.4	1.0	6.5	6.0	4.8	3.5	1.3	1.2
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $500	.9	1.2	.8	.9	2.2	2.5	--------	1.2	.3	.3	.4	.6	(2)	(2)
$500 to $999	.6	.1	.5	.8	--------	1.0	--------	1.2	1.9	1.0	.9	.6	1.7	1.4
$1,000 to $1,499	1.3	.7	.5	.9	1.1	3.0	--------	1.2	5.4	5.2	4.4	4.9	3.3	7.6
$1,500 to $1,999	1.9	.4	.9	1.3	2.2	4.4	--------	5.6	8.6	6.4	5.3	5.2	5.9	9.7
$2,000 to $2,499	3.2	1.7	1.7	1.4	4.6	1.0	--------	1.2	10.6	15.2	15.6	16.9	11.7	13.9
$2,500 to $2,999	3.0	1.7	1.2	1.7	3.2	6.9	--------	7.5	9.4	15.7	15.6	13.9	20.2	16.0
$3,000 to $3,499	3.2	3.5	1.3	2.3	5.2	4.4	--------	4.4	10.4	10.8	8.2	6.7	12.6	18.7
$3,500 to $3,999	3.2	2.7	2.0	2.5	6.2	2.5	--------	1.2	8.6	8.1	9.6	10.0	8.4	3.5
$4,000 to $4,499	3.8	3.6	3.5	2.8	3.8	5.9	--------	7.5	7.6	5.2	5.8	4.9	8.4	3.5
$4,500 to $4,999	3.0	3.2	2.7	2.9	1.9	4.4	--------	5.6	4.1	3.5	2.7	2.7	2.5	6.2
$5,000 to $5,499	6.5	9.7	6.3	6.4	5.7	7.9	--------	9.9	4.4	3.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	.7
$5,500 to $5,999	4.1	4.3	4.1	5.5	5.2	(2)	--------	--------	2.7	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.7	(2)
$6,000 to $6,499	6.8	9.6	7.6	6.5	2.7	5.9	--------	4.4	3.5	2.4	1.5	2.1	(2)	4.9
$6,500 to $6,999	5.4	6.1	5.7	6.5	5.1	6.4	--------	4.4	1.5	.3	.4	.6	(2)	(2)
$7,000 to $7,999	11.9	15.5	14.0	12.0	6.5	3.9	--------	3.1	2.9	3.5	4.7	4.2	5.9	(2)
$8,000 to $8,999	8.1	11.5	10.2	5.8	8.4	3.4	--------	4.4	2.0	2.7	3.6	4.2	1.7	(2)
$9,000 to $9,999	7.0	8.4	8.1	6.7	7.1	3.4	--------	4.3	2.0	3.5	3.6	2.7	5.9	3.5
$10,000 to $11,999	10.2	8.8	11.3	11.9	9.8	5.9	--------	6.2	5.9	5.4	4.7	4.2	5.9	7.6
$12,000 to $14,999	7.0	4.3	7.8	8.5	7.1	16.8	--------	13.0	3.5	2.7	3.1	4.2	(2)	1.4
$15,000 to $24,999	7.3	2.8	8.3	10.3	7.9	9.4	--------	7.5	3.5	2.0	2.2	3.0	(2)	1.4
$25,000 and over	1.6	.2	1.6	2.4	4.1	1.0	--------	1.2	1.2	1.5	2.0	2.7	(2)	(2)
Median [3]	$7,260	$7,100	$7,600	$7,640	$7,060	$6,540	--------	$6,340	$3,700	$3,290	$3,470	$3,570	$3,270	$3,040

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

TABLE 5.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veterans living with relative's family in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
						60 to 64 years				70 years and over				
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years	65 to 69 years	Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72	73 to 74	
Number (thousands)	1,355	275	596	280	[1] 72	[1] 25	[1] 9	[1] 16	[1] 45	[1] 62	[1] 38	[1] 17	[1] 21	[1] 24
Percent, by age	100.0	20.3	44.0	20.7	5.3	1.8	0.6	1.2	3.3	4.6	2.8	1.3	1.5	1.8
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Under $500	7.9	13.0	5.1	10.6	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$500 to $999	6.7	.9	6.7	3.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$1,000 to $1,499	5.4	6.5	2.6	3.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$1,500 to $1,999	5.8	4.3	4.7	6.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$2,000 to $2,499	3.5	.4	2.6	2.3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$2,500 to $2,999	3.3	2.2	5.1	1.9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$3,000 to $3,499	7.7	6.9	6.7	11.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$3,500 to $3,999	4.5	3.9	5.4	3.4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$4,000 to $4,499	6.6	6.1	6.5	7.9	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$4,500 to $4,999	5.4	2.6	8.6	4.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$5,000 to $5,499	11.0	9.1	11.8	11.4	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$5,500 to $5,999	3.6	8.2	2.4	4.2	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$6,000 to $6,499	5.7	9.9	5.8	6.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$6,500 to $6,999	2.4	2.6	2.8	2.3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$7,000 to $7,999	6.3	4.3	9.5	5.7	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$8,000 to $8,999	4.1	8.2	4.7	1.5	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$9,000 to $9,999	3.0	4.8	1.7	5.3	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$10,000 to $11,999	1.6	2.6	2.1	1.1	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$12,000 to $14,999	2.4	.9	1.3	3.8	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$15,000 to $24,999	2.5	1.3	3.0	3.0	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
$25,000 and over	.6	1.3	.9	(2)	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------
Median [3]	$4,400	$5,230	$4,770	$4,400	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

TABLE 6.—*Money income in 1964 of male war veteran unrelated individuals in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965												
						60 to 64 years				70 years and over				
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 59 years	Total	60 to 61 years	62 to 64 years	65 to 69 years	Total	70 to 74 years			75 years and over
											Total	70 to 72	73 to 74	
Number (thousands)	1,468	175	435	346	126	[1] 79	[1] 45	[1] 34	119	188	135	106	[1] 29	[1] 53
Percent, by age	100.0	11.9	29.6	23.6	8.6	5.4	3.1	2.3	8.1	12.8	9.2	7.3	1.9	3.6
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	-------	-------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	-------
Under $500	3.5	1.4	2.3	5.8	7.8	-------	-------	-------	1.9	2.7	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$500 to $999	6.5	3.4	4.3	7.1	7.0	-------	-------	-------	4.8	10.1	12.1	13.1	-------	-------
$1,000 to $1,499	7.3	7.5	2.0	6.7	6.1	-------	-------	-------	18.1	13.8	9.7	7.0	-------	-------
$1,500 to $1,999	8.1	2.7	3.8	3.7	12.2	-------	-------	-------	28.6	12.2	16.9	14.1	-------	-------
$2,000 to $2,499	8.2	2.7	4.4	7.4	9.6	-------	-------	-------	9.5	22.9	20.2	21.2	-------	-------
$2,500 to $2,999	4.8	2.0	3.8	3.7	4.4	-------	-------	-------	11.4	10.1	6.5	5.1	-------	-------
$3,000 to $3,499	3.3	8.8	2.3	2.8	4.3	-------	-------	-------	3.8	2.7	4.0	5.1	-------	-------
$3,500 to $3,999	5.3	6.1	4.4	6.1	4.4	-------	-------	-------	4.8	7.4	9.7	10.1	-------	-------
$4,000 to $4,499	3.8	4.8	4.6	3.1	2.6	-------	-------	-------	1.9	2.7	4.0	5.1	-------	-------
$4,500 to $4,999	4.5	6.8	7.2	2.8	4.3	-------	-------	-------	(2)	2.1	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$5,000 to $5,499	6.9	4.1	7.9	9.2	12.2	-------	-------	-------	(2)	6.4	8.1	10.1	-------	-------
$5,500 to $5,999	3.1	3.4	5.4	4.0	(2)	-------	-------	-------	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$6,000 to $6,499	6.4	21.1	9.2	4.0	4.4	-------	-------	-------	(2)	1.1	1.6	(2)	-------	-------
$6,500 to $6,999	3.5	3.4	4.9	5.2	4.3	-------	-------	-------	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$7,000 to $7,999	7.6	10.9	6.7	14.1	4.3	-------	-------	-------	1.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$8,000 to $8,999	5.3	4.1	9.7	1.2	4.3	-------	-------	-------	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$9,000 to $9,999	2.3	(2)	5.4	1.5	(2)	-------	-------	-------	1.9	1.1	1.6	2.0	-------	-------
$10,000 to $11,999	3.6	1.4	5.6	3.7	1.7	-------	-------	-------	1.9	2.6	4.0	5.1	-------	-------
$12,000 to $14,999	1.8	1.4	3.8	2.1	(3)	-------	-------	-------	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
$15,000 to $24,999	3.2	2.0	2.3	4.3	6.1	-------	-------	-------	4.8	2.1	1.6	2.0	-------	-------
$25,000 and over	.9	2.0	(2)	1.5	(3)	-------	-------	-------	4.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	-------	-------
Median [3]	$4,430	$5,490	$5,790	$5,060	$3,360	-------		-------	$1,940	$2,270	$2,280	$2,360	-------	-------

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data

Information about the 1964 income of male civilian noninstitutional war veterans in the United States was derived from the Bureau of the Census' March 1965 Current Population Survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The data were obtained for families headed by male war veterans, for war veterans living alone or with nonrelatives, and for war veterans living in the family of a relative. The income and family relationship distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional war veteran population in the United States to develop the data presented in this report. Although income data are for the year 1964, the age and family relationship refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see Consumer Income, Current Population Reports, series P-60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

The income of families (tables 1, 2, 3, and 4) was the amount received by all members of the family. The income of war veteran relatives of the head (table 5), and war veteran unrelated individuals (table 6) was that received by the veteran alone. All families include family groups in which the war veteran was married (wife present or wife absent), or he was widowed, divorced, or never married, but still the head of a family. Husband-wife families are only those in which the war veteran was married and his wife was present.

War veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces during a war period (Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Korean conflict); have been separated from active duty and are now in the civilian noninstitutional population. The civilian noninstitutional population excludes all members of the Armed Forces except those living off post or with their families on military reservations, and inmates of penal institutions, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and the like.

Reliability of the estimates

Since the estimates are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and enumerators. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and of reporting, as well as being subject to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability, that is, of the variations that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. As calculated for this report the standard error also partially measures the effects of response and enumeration errors but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample will differ from a complete census figure by less than 1 standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error. The following table shows the approximate standard error of an estimated percentage computed by using sample data for both the numerator and denominator of the percentage. The size of the standard error depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the class upon which the percentage is based.

Standard errors of estimated percentages (68 chances out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)								
	75	125	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000
2 or 98	3.4	2.6	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
5 or 95	5.1	4.0	2.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.6	.4	.3
10 or 90	6.7	5.4	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.2	.8	.5	.4
15 or 85	8.3	6.4	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.4	1.0	.7	.4
20 or 80	9.3	7.2	5.1	3.6	2.5	1.6	1.1	.8	.5
25 or 75	10.0	7.8	5.5	3.9	2.8	1.8	1.3	.8	.6
35 or 65	11.1	8.6	6.1	4.3	3.1	2.0	1.4	.9	.6
50	11.8	9.0	6.4	4.5	3.2	2.0	1.4	1.0	.7

May Craig

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Robert Hale, recently wrote a fine tribute to Mrs. May Craig, nationally known journalist, who recently retired as a columnist for the Guy Gannett Newspapers of Maine.

I know that this will be of great interest to the many friends of May Craig:

MAY CRAIG

I cannot witness the retirement of May Craig without more than a perfunctory notice. The representatives of the press here in Washington include the ablest and most distinguished members of the profession both in this country and from overseas. In this group May has had a place quite disproportionate to the circulation of the papers for which she writes. Her appearances on "Meet the Press" have made her a national figure recognized by millions of TV watchers. Her faculty for going to the heart of a question and her facility of statement have made her outstanding. I remember once hearing Sam Rayburn, the late Speaker of the House, say: "May, you can say the meanest things in the sweetest way of anyone I ever knew." What Sam meant by "mean" things was not, of course, "low" or "unworthy" but "penetrating" and "deflating." May could—and can—take the stuffing out of any shirt.

May has been the intimate friend of five Presidents, F.D.R., Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. The friendship was based in every instance on the hearty respect that these men felt for her ability as a reporter, her acuteness as an observer of the national scene, and her character as a human being, full of affection and compassion for all people everywhere in the world who suffer under what a French writer has called the "Condition humane."

Coming from a small town in South Carolina, and working for papers outside the world's great metropoles, May's vision is nonetheless neither meager nor provincial. She knows what life is like in Korea, in Africa, in South America as well as in the White House or the Capitol Building where her life has been mostly spent.

As a reporter, May is conscientious and fiercely diligent. I never knew her to "slant" a story or to try to squeeze the facts to support some particular theory or hypothesis.

May is certainly not an orthodox Republican. In the lifetime of F.D.R. she became something of a New Dealer, because she recognized the magnitude of the problems with which the Federal Government had to deal and admired Roosevelt's affirmative approach. She has never been, however, a servile admirer of any political party or of any man in public life. She is conscious of the foibles and defects of the greatest political figures, and has never feared to mention them.

Any man who in the last 30 years has had the honor of serving in Congress from the State of Maine must acknowledge a great debt of gratitude to May. I can still hear the voice of a House page saying: "Mrs. Craig to see you in the Speaker's lobby." I would then go out and tell May everything I could think of and a lot more things that I couldn't think of but she could.

I always found it hard to talk about what I was doing. Before going to Congress, I had practiced law. The first principle with a lawyer is not to talk about his clients or to discuss their affairs. That feeling was deeply ingrained in me. I didn't like to talk about what I was doing in Congress. May worked hard over me and helped me to articulate, though I fear that she never considered me a completely satisfactory pupil.

I have talked to people who thought May Craig was a typical State of Mainer. I explained to them that she was not a native of Maine and had never lived in Maine. Nevertheless by repeated visits in the State, and making many talks to Maine audiences she knew the flavor of the State and some of it brushed off on her. Despite her southern origin, her speech largely lost its regional characteristics. I doubt if even 'Enry 'Iggins could tell from May's speech just where she came from.

Readers of the Gannett papers have lost a lot now that May has retired. Those who succeed her will be capable and no less conscientious. But May was May. She was discursive. She jumped about. She would mix the gravest national problems with starlings and squirrels and what somebody wore to a party. But it was all and always interesting. I confess that my wife and I looked for her column, when we first picked up our paper. In later years when her column wasn't in every day we would sometimes have to [illegible] in today." When we did, it [illegible]ment.

I h[illegible] May will write her book. She has [illegible] write about. She has known pl[illegible]ople and been to plenty of p[illegible]s ridden in every kind of c[illegible] plane and helicopter. [illegible] every type of vehicle [illegible] the rest of us who have [illegible] last few years she has been [illegible] with the bacilli of all sorts of [illegible]amiliar and unfamiliar. Abo[illegible] knows her Nation's Capitol and nev[illegible] to feel the thrill of the great white dome and the flags which mean that House and Senate are in session and the tall white shaft of the Washington Monument—pointing into what was once considered inviolable space.

All of us are travelers on an adventurous and ultrahazardous planet. May is one who loves it and has helped us to appraise it, to see its prospects in squalor as in grandeur, in horror as in delight. Long may she live and prosper.

ROBERT HALE.

DECEMBER 16, 1965.

Panama Canal and Guantanamo Vital for Caribbean Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a number of my addresses over the past few years dealing with Caribbean and Isthmian policy matters, I have stressed the interrelation of our Guantanamo Naval Base and the Panama Canal in regard to the security of the strategic Caribbean basin. What happens to one will inevitably have its impact on the other.

The Castro government in Cuba, following the example of Panama, is now demanding the renegotiation of the Guantanamo Naval Base Treaty. This is another reason why our positions at both Panama and Guantanamo should be made clear—that there will be no surrender of our treaty based rights, power and authority over these strategic points so vital for the security of the Western Hemisphere.

Two recent news stories on this subject follow:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Oct. 19, 1965]

NEW PANAMA TREATY SEEN STIRRING GUANTANAMO CRISIS

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps., retired, director of national security and foreign affairs, Veterans of Foreign Wars)

WASHINGTON.—Does the new treaty with Panama, as outlined by President Johnson, mean new trouble in the Caribbean? The answer, say some of the keenest Washington observers of Caribbean affairs, is "Yes."

They explain it this way:

While the authority of the United States in the treaty-established Canal Zone appears to be the immediate issue, there is good reason to suspect that it is neither the ultimate nor the most important issue from the standpoint of the Communists.

Long-range Kremlin-Cuban strategy calls for undermining the U.S. dominance in the Caribbean area. Diluting our longtime control of the Canal Zone is a necessary step for the Moscow planners.

However, it is not the final step. As important as Panama is to U.S. security, the Soviet Union knows that its hope to turn the Caribbean into a Red lake will not be realized as long as the United States has full control of the great naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Therefore, Soviet Premier Alexi N. Kosygin and Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro long ago planned to use the Panama issue as a key part of their plan to kick us out of the Guantanamo base.

Our renegotiation of the Panama Canal treaty can serve as a potent pretext for demands that we renegotiate the treaty by which we would hold that increasingly valuable base.

This is not empty forecasting. It is exactly what the Communists have announced they would do. Their propaganda already has tied the two treaties together and thereby laid the basis for their demands for renegotiation of the Guantanamo treaty.

Only a few months ago, it was carefully explained by a Havana broadcast. The broadcast said both treaties are archaic. Hence, a new Panama treaty proves the need for doing the same for Guantanamo.

"POLITICAL QUESTION"

Here are a few points from the Havana broadcast:

"The standards of modern times apply everywhere, and Guantanamo—just as Panama—is an anachronistic survival of colonialism. The question of Panama is a political question * * * not to be decided by admirals or generals * * * but between the states in accordance with international law."

Castro may be posing here as a stalwart supporter of peaceful solution of the issue, but again his hypocrisy is evident in his deeds. At the same time as this broadcast was being beamed from Havana, Castro, with Russian assistance, was busily engaged in building a ring of concrete fortifications around Guantanamo Bay.

It all fits into the Red grand plan to force us out of the base. On order from Moscow, Castro can fully man the fortifications. A few shots would heat up the crisis.

POINT TO PANAMA

Then Moscow, with its supporting chorus in the United Nations, would demand we renegotiate our Guantanamo Treaty, pointing to Panama as justification for our doing so.

Thus, a new treaty with Panama, however necessary it is from the administration viewpoint, would move us closer to a bigger crisis than the one it is designed to solve. As Moscow plans it, it would move the Soviet submarine fleet closer to having Guantanamo Bay as a base for operations in the Gulf of Mexico and along the east coast of the United States.

[From Human Events, Nov. 13, 1965]

GUANTANAMO TROUBLES BREWING?

When Fidel Castro, an avowed revolutionary, poses as a stalwart proponent of peace and a champion of international law, it is time to hoist the danger signals.

The warring hand of Castro is at this moment evident in perhaps a dozen Latin American nations where Cuban-trained guerrillas terrorize the countryside and threaten constituted governments. In the immediate vicinity of his own island fortress, however, the Cuban dictator insists that the principles of international law must apply at the Guantanamo Naval Base. He, of course, will interpret the principles.

The whole affair might be ludicrous were it not for the fact that the Castro charade could mean trouble for the United States in the future. His antics should serve as another lesson that atheistic Communist dictators fatten on free world concessions.

In the case of Castro, the invitation to troublemaking began with an announcement by the United States that it is willing to give Panama more sovereignty over the canal, as Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle (USMC, retired, director of national security and foreign affairs for the Veterans of Foreign Wars, pointed out.

Dilution of authority over the strategically important Panama Canal is to the advantage of the Communists, seeking toeholds in the American hemisphere. They also are aware, however, that they can never dominate the Caribbean so long as the powerful U.S. Navy base remains at Guantanamo.

So Castro is trying to use renegotiation of the Panama treaty as a basis for renegotiating the Guantanamo base pact. Havana radio has declared: "Guantanamo—just as Panama—is an anachronistic survival of colonialism. The question of Panama is a political question * * * not to be decided by admirals or generals * * * but between the states in accordance with international law."

Not trusting entirely to international law, Castro has built a ring of fortifications around Guantanamo Bay. A few shots, blasts of propaganda and an echo from Moscow and the United States would face another trouble spot.

We should make it plain at Panama and at Guantanamo that the United States of America will not relinquish a millimeter of its security plans as long as the Communist threat exists. International law, if it has any force, also recognizes that treaties are solemn obligations. The United States has long-term treaties at both Panama and Guantanamo.

And if Castro wishes to follow international law he might start thinking about his political executions, expropriation of billions in U.S. property and free elections in Cuba.

Who Protects the Public?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I commend to this body an editorial that appeared in Newsday of January 5, 1966. It creates a number of questions that would be well worth consideration by this body and I wish to acknowledge my appreciation to Newsday for speaking out on this important subject at this time.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert the following editorial:

WHO PROTECTS THE PUBLIC?

President Johnson, who has no official power to regulate prices, has assumed that power informally. He has criticized three companies for raising the per ton price of structural steel, and three major Government agencies—Defense, Commerce, and the General Services Administration—will in effect boycott these companies, plus others that might later also increase prices.

The President's action, however much he may seem to justify it, is wholly illegal, and of a piece with similar actions taken by himself and by the late President Kennedy to hold the line on the prices of metals. No similar action of such force has been taken against labor, which, through its wage and fringe-benefits demands, represents the other side of the problem of inflation.

This Nation does not yet recognize it, but we have come to the point where the public interest demands a method of fixing both prices and wages so that the economy does not suffer and so that national welfare plus national defense are best served. Collective bargaining has become a process of wheeling and dealing: Labor gets all or most of what it wants, and industry then raises prices. The two rival monopolies make noises indicating dissent, but the end result is that the consumer gets it in the neck.

A court of conciliation, as proposed by the late Bernard M. Baruch, appears no longer to be the complete answer. What is needed is a national agency to dictate wages and prices on the basis of fairness and the national benefit. Obviously the underpaid should be paid decently, and given the same fringe benefits generally enjoyed by most wage earners. Obviously, also, these benefits must be weighed against the ability of each specific industry to earn a decent but not excessive profit while maintaining, enlarging, or modernizing its plant to keep pace with demand for the items it produces.

This may sound like socialism, but in effect this country is Socialist, anyway, in many respects. Free enterprise, as such, no longer exists. All businesses are subject to some government controls or depend in part at least upon government subsidies or tax benefits. A wage-price board might well consist one third of representatives of labor, one third of representatives of industry, and one third of distinguished citizens representing the general public, the lattermost third to be chosen by the other two thirds. Congress, of course, would have to create such a board and to guarantee its independence from political motives and pressures, as it has done with the Federal Reserve Board and a whole host of independent agencies.

The purpose of such a board would be to intervene when strikes would otherwise be threatened in crucial industries. Whether it is steel or metropolitan transportation, whether the monopoly is privately or publicly owned, there must be a body of dispassionate citizens to weigh the issues and to take prompt action. Under such a system, the New York transit strike, with its shattering effects upon the people and the economy of the metropolitan area, never could have happened.

No such legislation, however, can succeed without the proper climate and the support of the public. Unfortunately, it is likely to take many more near-disasters before an aroused public will demand of the President and of its representatives in Congress something more than half measures. That day will come if overweening labor leaders and overweening leaders of industrial monopolies continue to persist in ignoring the public interest in order to advance selfish interests.

Intrigue in the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Carl T. Rowan's column, which appeared in the Evening Star of January 12, is most interesting. In the first place, Mr. Rowan handled the publicity for the White House and certainly is knowledgeable about what is going on in the poverty program and has sources of information not available to the ordinary correspondent because of his former White House connections.

It is common knowledge, of course, that many of the executives and top employees of the Office of Economic Opportunity are leaving the ship because of the various involvements which the Office of Economic Opportunity has gotten itself into, such as political intrigue, political appointments, and wasting taxpayers' money. Mr. Rowan's column follows:

> INTRIGUE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY
>
> (By Carl T. Rowan)
>
> If wars are won on the morale of troops, prepare a victory for poverty. Morale is lower than a centipede's toenail among the bureaucrats here who are supposed to be leading the war on poverty.
>
> Ranking officials have been quitting the Office of Economic Opportunity at an alarming rate, robbing the programs of needed continuity of guidance. For example, the two top men running the Job Corps are new.
>
> The public explanation of Sargent Shriver, OEO Director, that he prefers "the best man" for a short time to the continuity of a "less able" man is not being accepted, even with a grain of salt, inside the program.
>
> More resignations are expected from officers who complain that their authority is usurped and that Shriver's aids make decisions affecting their areas that they learn about only by reading the newspapers.
>
> Dr. Samuel Proctor, a former college president who has served with distinction in the Peace Corps and is now New York Regional Director of OEO, has submitted his resignation twice in recent weeks. He was in Washington last week, getting his arm twisted by Sargent Shriver and Bill Moyers, White House press secretary and former Peace Corps colleague. He may stay on a while.
>
> Ironically, the man who heads (on paper, anyhow) the vital community action program has no intention of resigning but he is the subject of a weird assortment of press leaks, office rumors, and interoffice power plays designed to force him to quit.
>
> He is Theodore M. Berry, prominent Negro lawyer, former vice mayor of Cincinnati and board member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
>
> Berry's troubles began last August when he was asked to take a subordinate position as Chicago Regional Director of the OEO. He refused.
>
> Reliable sources report the White House wanted Berry out to open up a job for Franklin Williams, who was angry over having been given 12 hours of notice that James Roosevelt was coming to the United Nations to replace him as Ambassador and representative on the Economic and Social Council.
>
> When Berry made it clear that he wouldn't be pushed around, Williams was named Ambassador to Ghana and the matter apparently was dropped.
>
> Then, a leak was planted in a syndicated column that Berry was about to resign. Berry denied it and Shriver repeated Berry's denial in a press conference.
>
> NAACP officials in the Midwest tell me that one of them wrote Shriver on September 17 expressing concern that Berry might be leaving the war on poverty. Shriver replied on October 19 by repeating the press conference denial. He concluded by writing:
>
> "I personally shared Mr. Berry's sentiments in his statements to the press that he plans to stay on so long as he can be—as he certainly is today—of real service to the President and this program."
>
> Still, a New York Times reporter wrote last week that Shriver wants Berry to resign. Shriver hoped, according to OEO rumors, that after the major surgery Berry had recently, the latter would come back more docile than he was in August and would bow out meekly.
>
> Those who know Berry predict that he won't accommodate whoever it is who hopes he will resign. As a Presidential appointee, he can be asked to resign only by President Johnson. Berry seems to believe in the kind of integrity they had in the old days when, if you believed a man wasn't doing a good job and wanted his resignation, you faced him like a man and told him so. So far Berry faces only rumors—and silence on the part of those who could squelch the rumors.
>
> Part of Shriver's or the President's reluctance to meet the issue head on obviously is an administration concern about Berry's NAACP friends. But some OEO officers say the reluctance also springs from the honest knowledge that the attempt to ease Berry out is merely an effort to hand a sacrificial lamb to those Congressmen who are most critical of the community action program.
>
> Berry is discreet to a fault in responding to press querries. All he will say is that he joined the war on poverty for the duration.
>
> I expect, however, that if anybody has a discharge for him, dishonorable, medical, or otherwise, he'd appreciate a direct presentation.
>
> The Nation's poor would benefit from less intrigue and more direct action, too.

Congressman Conte Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of this body two very fitting honors which were bestowed on the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, SILVIO O. CONTE.

On April 29, 1965, Congressman CONTE was honored by an honorary membership in Phi Sigma Alpha, political science honorary, at Northern University in Boston. Then in December, he was initiated in Phi Delta Phi legal fraternity.

In accepting the Phi Sigma Alpha award, our colleague said in part:

> In politics, as much as in any other field, there is a mutually constructive and beneficial relationship between the theorist and the activist—between the teacher and the doer. We must exploit this relationship to the fullest. I think the future of the country depends in large measure on how successful we are in establishing a dialog between the poles of theory and action.
>
> Today, at least as urgently as ever before in our history, this country is in need of enlightened public officials, men and women who are dedicated to some higher goal than simply winning elections and holding office.
>
> We must have a recommitment to the ideals and principles of the Nation's founders who not only dreamed the great dream, but had the practical skill and wisdom to bring that dream to reality.
>
> I do not wish to imply that such men are not in our midst today. I believe, by and large, most of those in public service are sincere, honest, forthright men who are motivated by the highest ideals and principles. Unfortunately, the political spectrum in which many of them must circulate does not always permit decisions or advocacies that are in the best interests of all the voters.
>
> A man cannot bring much influence to bear on government until he comes to power, and the road to power is paved with political bargains, kickbacks, patronage, false promises, and all the other degrading, underhanded tricks that are designed to curry favor and serve the powers of vested interest.
>
> By the time a man reaches the heights of power on this escalator, he is apt to be too corrupted or obligated to exercise it honestly and in a statesmanlike manner.
>
> On the other hand, the sworn obligations of a Member of Congress, for example, are paradoxically at odds with the role of the academic theorist. A Congressman is too deeply committed to the day-to-day operations of the system in which he functions.
>
> In that system, his role must be a partisan one. That is, he must operate to a very considerable extent on the basis of partisan commitments, on a very distinct political bias. Thus, he is compelled to give up a sizable measure of the objectivity which is an indispensable virtue of the scholar.
>
> The scholar is not so pressured. He can and must assert his independence and his objectivity. He cannot allow his judgment to be even partially colored by partisan affiliations or commitments.
>
> Not since the very dawn of our society, when our Founding Fathers forged a batch of revolutionary ideas into a republic have we seen the roles of practical politics and objective scholarship woven together in a tight-knit-viable fabric.
>
> Our admiration of the Founding Fathers from the vantage point of history stems, in large part, from the fact that they combined the skills of practical politics with the wisdom and balanced judgments of classic scholars. They were statesmen in the truest sense of the word.
>
> It must be conceded that we have lost a measure of that erudition in our public leadership over the years. We have seen power pass through corrupt and abusive fingers. We have seen politics manipulated for gain and vested interest. We have produced a

> somewhat tarnished folk image which puts the politician a cut or two below the statesman. We have seen the separation of politician and political scientist.
>
> There is, on the other hand, a very serious and respectable effort being made these days to resolve some of the complex problems that have grown up as a direct result of the separation of practical politics from political science. The process of academic inquiry goes on and, I think, is presently enjoying a unique resurgence among scholars and politicians alike.
>
> There has even been, surprisingly, a gradual swing of the pendulum in some schools of thought away from the traditions and principles which have given them their lifeblood.
>
> We seek a union of scientific rationale and the cold-blooded pragmatism of everyday politics.

On December 4, the Massachusetts Congressman was inducted into Phi Delta Phi, with which many of the Members of this body are associated.

The honor was bestowed at the National Lawyers Club by the Marshall Inn in recognition of our colleague's dedication as a law student when he completed a 3-year course in 2 years in addition to holding down several part-time positions; for his service to his community as a member of the legal profession, and for his outstanding political achievements.

By his initiation he joined the heritage of such men as the late, gifted statesman, John Foster Dulles; the former Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn; Senator William Fulbright; Justice Hugo Black; Senator Dan Inouye; and Senator Leverett Saltonstall, the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

At the initiation ceremony, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] made some remarks of which, I think, the legal profession and the Members of this body should be cognizant so that they can give guidance to their ultimate fulfillment.

He said in part:

> If there is some counsel which I, as practicing politician involved with the scope and activity of our Federal Government, could give you tonight, it would be to dedicate yourselves to safeguarding the preeminence of the individual to society; and, more specifically, to apply the great skills you have developed toward making law responsive to the needs of the individual, to making it the protector and servant of all the people, not just those who can afford to buy it.
>
> In all fairness, I must also tell you that such a course is not an easy or materially rewarding one. You won't get rich solving the problems of the poor. But if you are like me, you will find the psychic satisfactions more than adequate. And, there is both a challenge and a responsibility for each of us in this work.
>
> Let me tell some of the reasons why I feel it is so important.
>
> Today this Nation and the world are in the midst of some of the most revolutionary social changes since the Germanic barbarians overran the Roman Empire. The thrust of this modern social revolution is moving us closer and closer to the lotus beds of a paternalistic welfare state in which the Federal Government will clothe and house and feed us; will plan our cities and pay our bills; will plant our crops and fence our wilderness; and will tend our ills, deliver our babies, and bury our dead.
>
> There are now programs of aid and assistance for just about every phase of life that could pose the slightest problem for us. We have a broadly comprehensive program for aid to education. We have disaster aid for business, medicare for the aged, social security, housing grants and loans, and now we even have a program whereby the Government is going to subsidize rent payments for the poor.
>
> In order to make all of these programs work, in addition to the controls and tax regulations and fair employment rules that set the boundaries, a vast body of administrative law has been created.
>
> It is with this kind of law that the poor and underprivileged must deal in order to take advantage of the assistance programs which have been set up for their benefit. The paradox is that they are also the least equipped to deal with such law. They are the least able to understand, and the least able to pay for someone else's understanding and counsel.
>
> This is not the spirit of the new jurisprudence. This is not preserving and upholding the preeminence of the individual. This is subordinating the individual to the clumsy, sluggish, random machinery of the state. It subordinates him to the institutions that are created to help him.
>
> It is in this realm, I believe, that the greatest challenge lies for the legal profession today. It lies in bending this sudden new, mammoth body of administrative law applied in what Justice Brennan termed the administrative forum, as distinct from the judicial forum, to the individual. It lies in bringing that law to the individual and making it work for him; in establishing the recognition of human beings as the most distinctive and important feature of the universe; and in forcing upon government the limitations which, Justice Brennan argues, are necessary to preserve human dignity and our sacred heritage of freedom.
>
> There is a job to be done here and I can tell you, from the vantage point of a U.S. Congressman, that job is not being done today.
>
> Probably 75 percent of a Congressman's time, on the average, is spent trying to help some poor guy back home get himself out of a tax jam, or get a fair shake on some land the Government wants, or to press a claim on his social security, or some other similar problem involving a confrontation with an agency of the Federal Government.
>
> Unfortunately, 75 percent of a Congressman's time—or even 100 percent—is not enough to help all the individuals with problems.
>
> The gap persisted and the number of problems grows in direct proportion to the growth of the Government. If we are to create meaningful progress for society, we must make certain these programs serve the people who need them. We must bend every effort to keep them from becoming simply a rathole for tax dollars, a system for creating Federal jobs but little else.
>
> Pay heed to the problems of the poor. Give of your time and talent to bringing the law to the poor, to giving them the legal assistance they so desperately need. It is an obligation you must face, an obligation to your country and to your fellow man.

Open Letter to the President on Our Policy in Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent, I include herewith the text of an open letter on the subject of our policy in Vietnam which I sent to the President on December 8, 1965:

> President Lyndon B. Johnson,
> *The White House,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> Dear Mr. President: In my congressional district, as I am sure in others, there is a deep and growing uneasiness about the situation in Vietnam. This feeling has been accentuated recently by the disclosures that our Government had been sounded out a year ago by U Thant, on the possibility of talks with Hanoi, and had reacted negatively. It has also been accentuated by the fact that Secretary McNamara, who once spoke of getting finished in Vietnam in a few months, now talks of a long struggle, and that Secretary Rusk offers no plan for the achievement of negotiations looking toward an honorable and stable peace.
>
> I do not mean to suggest that the majority of my constituents are not willing to support you on Vietnam. Of 8,000 replies I received last June to a questionnaire, 58 percent indicated support of your general policy or even more drastic measures. While the stepup since then in the scale of our military efforts, and the rising casualty rate, may have caused some diminution in this percentage, I believe the majority of my constituents are prepared to trust your judgment as to what is necessary. Nevertheless, the number of thoughtful, patriotic people who are expressing their unhappiness about what is going on is certainly increasing.
>
> First of all, there is uncertainty as to what our position is. Last spring we were told that more Americans had to be sent to Vietnam because we were losing; recently we have been told that more men have to go though we are not losing. Statements that you make, indicating your determination to find a peaceful solution, seem to be contradicted by members of your administration. For example, last summer you stated that the issue of whether or not we should talk with representatives of the Vietcong would not be an obstacle to negotiations, but since then Secretary Rusk has repeated that we could not deal with the Vietcong. (As I have previously stated, I myself cannot see how we could refuse to include the Vietcong in any serious negotiations; they would be bound to be involved, for example, in any talks regarding the conduct of elections in South Vietnam.)
>
> Second, there is a feeling, which I share, that we have somehow been drawn, step by step, into a situation which is to no one's advantage so much as that of the Communist Chinese, and that we appear to have no plan for extricating ourselves from this veritable trap. Increased military activity on our part leads to increased military activity on the part of the Communists to which we in turn feel we must respond with counteraction, and so on and on.
>
> We talk about our desire to negotiate, yet our offers to negotiate—our alleged weekly feelers—often seem couched in terms that make it impossible for the North Vietnamese, as prideful nationalists, to accept them. For example, we say that we have repeatedly tried to find out whether Hanoi would be willing to negotiate if we suspended our bombings of North Vietnam. Can we not understand that, to the Communists, an affirmative answer to this kind of querry would seem like a surrender, a sign of national weakness?
>
> Or we say that we will suspend bombing in the north if Hanoi will pull out one division from the south. Again, from their point of view, what kind of deal would that be? To suspend our bombing would cost us nothing, and we could resume at any moment; but for Hanoi to pull out a division would mean the waste of the enormous effort involved in bringing the divi-

sion into South Vietnam, and to reverse the process and send the division back south would be equally costly.

From the beginning, we should have been trying to stimulate the natural Vietnamese fear of the Chinese, and to keep Hanoi, if possible, from becoming wholly dependent on Peiping. Yet the effect of our actions has apparently been just the opposite—to drive a reluctant Hanoi into the embrace of Peiping. Hanoi's present apparent rejection of any negotiations, except on terms that would represent a total surrender for us, parallels Peiping's position completely. Somehow we must find a way to reverse the trend.

I tend to agree with those who feel that we have not been imaginative in our efforts to negotiations started, that we have assumed, without justification and incorrectly, that we could pressure Hanoi to agree to negotiate by military action that would hurt. And I am emphatically opposed to the current argument that we can accomplish our objective by hurting Hanoi still more; e.g. by extending the bombing to industrial and other targets in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Such tactics would not only be likely to stiffen still more the resistance and determination of the North Vietnamese, but would once again be driving Hanoi more firmly than ever into total dependence on Peiping.

I know that you, Mr. President, are desperately concerned about American casualties in Vietnam, and that you want to see to it that our forces have every bit of equipment and supplies they need to carry out the tasks they are given to do. I feel the same way.

I also believe, Mr. President, that you want to get the fighting stopped as soon as possible, so as to put an end to the casualties. These purposes are not inconsistent. Both are important. Both are in the interest of our fighting men.

Since our present course of action seems to be leading only to steady intensification of the hostilities, and does not seem to be bringing a peaceful settlement any closer, is it not imperative that we seek new approaches to the solution of our ghastly problem?

Specifically, should we not suspend the bombing of North Vietnam once again, and mobilize the influence of the nonalined nations of Asia to help us get negotiations started. In making such a gesture to emphasize our desire to end the hostilities, we would do well to link the announcement to the Buddhist religious holidays, such as the New Year which occurs in January, rather than referring solely to our own Christmas and Chanukah season. Instead of announcing a time limit to the suspension, which would once again have an ultimatum-like sound, we should, I believe, leave the matter of duration indefinite. An encouraging response might take time to develop and emerge.

Even more dramatically, we might well announce a unilateral cease-fire in the south, coupled with a proposal that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese units suspend hostile action, also. If they refused to so respond, we would be free to resume military action ourselves within a matter of hours.

Granted, it might be difficult to get the South Vietnamese Government to agree to these procedures, but the effort should be made, and surely we are not without means of persuasion. If such persuasion proves impossible, we should proceed with the conciliatory moves on our own.

Let it not be said that such a course might cause political trouble in Saigon. That argument was somewhat persuasive when we still held to the position that this was Saigon's war to win. Today that position is in tatters. It has become our war—not to win, because a military solution is impossible—but our war to fight until we can find a way to negotiate an honorable and lasting settlement. Our own involvement is now too great for us to allow the unpredictable political winds in Saigon to deflect us from the course we want to take.

I cannot say that such measures as I have proposed would lead to fruitful negotiations, or to any negotiations. They will not, I am sure, if Peiping can help it. But I do say that I can see no better way for us to try to escape from the morass we are now in. And we should explore every possibility of escape that is open to us, instead of stubbornly plowing deeper into the morass day by day.

Sincerely,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

Jerseyans Signing Up To Teach Viets Our Three R's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to insert at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Daily News on January 9, 1966 concerning a very idealistic constituent of mine.

James Sansone is a very remarkable young man. I think his story is worthy of the attention of all Members. Under unanimous consent I insert this article at this point in the RECORD.

The article follows:

JERSEYANS SIGNING UP TO TEACH VIETS OUR THREE R'S

(By Daniel O'Grady)

Triggered by the growing number of draft card burnings and other pacifist demonstrations, a 31-year-old high school teacher is organizing a statewide drive to recruit teachers to staff schools in Vietnam next summer without pay.

The project, just begun, is expected to be in full swing next month in order to prepare the volunteers for the overseas assignment, according to James Sansone, a math teacher at Wallington High School in Bergen County, the man behind the unique movement.

"We feel that the handful of students and teachers connected with the demonstrations are giving educated people in general a bad name," Sansone, a bachelor, explained. "That's why we started the program to teach the South Vietnamese.

"We hope to demonstrate how most educated people feel about our country's policy in Vietnam," he added.

SUMMONED TO WASHINGTON

Early in December, Sansone wrote to the State Department outlining his idea and, after an exchange of letters, was invited to Washington to elaborate on the plan.

There he met with State Department representatives December 16 and they urged him to begin his recruiting campaign. According to Sansone the officials also said that Uncle Sam would foot the bill for travel and living expenses of the volunteers if the recruiting drive proved successful.

Sansone will meet with Governor Hughes during the coming week to ask for permission to recruit in the State's colleges. He also will ask for use of classrooms and some additional financing to cover the cost of the campaign. The classrooms will be used to teach volunteers the Vietnamese language in an intensive 20-week course.

The teachers who are ready to go after school closes next summer must be prepared to teach the equivalent of 1 year of school in 10 weeks. Including travel time, they will be away from home 12 weeks.

THIRTY-ONE ALREADY ENROLLED

Thirty-one teachers already have volunteered for the program and Sansone receives more and more mail each day requesting information and application blanks. And the phone never seems to stop ringing in his home at 370 Liberty Avenue, Jersey City, and at school.

"One of the State Department's field representatives said 200 teachers could be put to use right now in Vietnam," Sansone said. "We are hoping this program will mushroom all over the country, but we are only interested in New Jersey teachers," he added.

This program will be different from the Peace Corps, he explained, because it will be privately administered and restricted to teachers.

Sansone originally started out to be an electrical engineer and holds bachelor of science degrees in both electrical and electronic engineering from Fairleigh Dickinson University. When he realized he didn't want to spend the rest of his life as an engineer he attended New York University and Montclair State Teachers College to earn enough education credits to teach.

Sansone was athletic director and assistant to the principal at Ferris High School, Jersey City, before joining the Wallington faculty last year.

The energetic teacher, who looks fit enough to be a track star, said his group and future volunteers will be offering the thing they know best, teaching, to help the Vietnamese.

Perhaps, he added, the tours in the future could be lengthened to 1 or 2 years and spread to countries other than Vietnam. But right now he is only concerned with this summer's program and lining up volunteers.

A House Stall on Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the last session, the San Francisco Examiner wrote a strong editorial on behalf of home rule for the District of Columbia. Their reaction is an indication of the widespread national concern about the fate of proposals for District self-government. I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Oct. 2, 1965]

A HOUSE STALL ON HOME RULE

Smithville (the name is fictional, the facts are not) is an undistinguished community of small population. But it selects its own public officials, operates its own municipal program.

Washington, D.C., is the National Capital. It has an 800,000 population. But it cannot name its own officials or set up its own municipal policies.

The President and Congress handle it all—services, taxes, financing. The people have no direct say.

The case for home rule for the Nation's Capital City has been convincingly made, yet there are those in Congress who continue to drag their feet.

They prevailed in the House this week when that body approved a bill calling merely for a referendum on whether the residents of the District of Columbia want home rule.

This is a point so firmly established in the affirmative long ago that one can only conclude the House majority is only stalling.

The Senate already has approved a workable home rule measure to become effective next year. It sets up a locally elected mayor and city council. The Federal Government would, under this proposal, retain the right of review in certain circumstances for the very logical reason that Washington is a federally purposed city and in that sense unique.

But the residents should not remain virtually without voice in the management of their own affairs.

The bill apparently is dead for this session, a sorry defeat for reason and justice.

It Takes 'Em Off Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has spoken to the American people of this Nation's continuing commitment to the poor and the hopeless.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the December 25, 1965, edition of the Tampa Times dealing with a unique effort in the war on poverty called Operation HOPEFUL. It is being carried out under the direction of the State of Florida's Welfare Department and is already turning frustrated, empty lives which have been dependent upon the welfare rolls into productive, hope-filled wage earners. The article speaks for itself. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Times, Dec. 25, 1965]

OPERATION HOPEFUL: IT TAKES 'EM OFF WELFARE

(By Stewart Bryan, Times staff writer)

Just over 3 months ago, at the beginning of September, Operation HOPEFUL opened classroom doors to selected poverty-stricken mothers on the State welfare rolls.

Since that time, approximately 180 women have been enrolled in HOPEFUL, the fourth local project to be funded under the national war on poverty.

Of these enrollees, 140 remain at HOPEFUL's Albany Street quarters in basic education classes, while 41 have gone on to paying jobs or on-the-job training.

Operation HOPEFUL got its name from the first letters of words in the phrase, "Help others produce effectively for useful lives," composed mainly by Betty Cornette, District 7 director of State welfare. The project is sponsored by the welfare department.

It got its official start in July with the appointment of Tampa attorney, Mrs. Raquel Little, as project director.

Several experienced social workers from the welfare department were transferred to the project under the direction of Mrs. Crystal Kissinger. A work placement specialist, retired Army Lt. Col. Russell F. McCallister, and two assistants, June Houghton and Viola Goldberg, were hired.

And the school system contributed a principal, F. H. Thomas, and 11 teachers. Thomas also serves as principal of the adult evening classes at Jefferson High School. He and the teachers are paid out of poverty funds made available by a special contract between the school system and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Basically, the idea of HOPEFUL is "to upgrade the enrollees' education and increase their work skills through training," Mrs. Little pointed out. Then the ladies can be placed in an employment situation, and welfare assistance can be stopped.

Prior to enrolling or on the first day, each lady is tested by the staff. Although there have been several high school graduates in the program, most of them dropped out of school.

"The test results are almost as varied as the individuals themselves," McCallister noted.

The ladies range in age from 20 to 49. Each of them has at least one dependent child, and each is the primary breadwinner for her family.

According to initial testing scores, the enrollees are assigned to classrooms.

"These classes are ungraded," Thomas explained, "but the ladies are grouped according to achievement."

After a month, they are tested again to see what progress has been made. Then they may go on to another class, or they may be ready for employment.

"Even in one month," Thomas said, "you can get back in the groove."

McCallister and his assistants maintain contact with prospective employers. They counsel with the ladies, find out what type of work they would like to do, and inform them what is available.

Various employees have various requirements. Some require a high school education, some a 10th grade education. Some want girls within a specific IQ range, others don't care.

As soon as a HOPEFUL enrolee attains the necessary level for the job she wants, McCallister places her. And he continues to check with her and her employer.

"A student expresses a desire for a particular job," McCallister explains. "If the job requires a specific level of education, we try to get her up to it."

"Most of these ladies have given some thought to what jobs they want." McCallister continued, "but in some cases it has been mostly dreaming."

To illustrate, he cited the case of one student with a sixth grade level of education, who wanted to be a practical nurse.

LPN training requires high school graduation, and McCallister pointed out that it was impossible, within the scope of HOPEFUL, to raise her educational level from the 6th grade to the 12th.

But in the majority of cases, the women recognize their own limitations, and are happy with their new jobs.

"There has been no ill feeling in any instance," McCallister said, "nothing but praise. And we've placed no one in a job where she doesn't get at least the minimum wage."

It's still too early to tell what the average stay of a student in classes will be, Mrs. Little said. Some of the ladies have been there since the project started, while others were placed in a week's time.

But no one is likely to find fault with a project that has created 40 new wage earners out of welfare recipients, and shows every indication that it will do so for at least three times that many more.

Interest on Poor Man's Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times on January 11 had an editorial entitled "Fair Play on Savings Bonds" and because I agree with the sentiments expressed in the editorial, I am calling it to the attention of my colleagues by quoting it now at length.

FAIR PLAY ON SAVINGS BONDS

Alert investors have been getting much higher yields since the Federal Reserve raised interest rates in December. But buyers of savings bonds from the U.S. Treasury still receive just 3¾ percent on their purchases. Thus the Treasury is, in effect, shortchanging savings bond buyers, who are mainly people in the low- and middle-income brackets.

Apparently these small savers are also learning that savings bonds are no bargain. Despite the fact that many bonds are bought through payroll deduction plans, sales in December were 11 percent less than they were a year earlier.

A higher rate of interest on Treasury savings bonds would protect small investors who do not know their way around the financial markets. By increasing purchases of the bonds, it would also help the fight against inflation. There is no need to make bond rates competitive with marketable Treasury obligations, which fluctuate in price, or even with the new high rates being offered financial institutions. Savings bonds are the safest of securities and offer a tax advantage as well; so a small increase would suffice.

The President has the power to raise the rate to a maximum of 4¼ percent. It will take at least 4 percent to play fair with small savers. We think 4 percent should be offered them—and soon.

Because most of the holders of Treasury savings bonds are in the low- and middle-income bracket and have no lobby here in Washington, I am prepared to join others who articulate their problems, in endeavoring to get the President of the United States to exercise his power to raise the rate of interest on these bonds.

It is most significant that on the same day that this editorial appeared in the Times there were other articles in the Wall Street Journal which pointed up the necessity for Presidential action at this time. These articles contained the following significant information:

First. Yields on Treasury's latest issues of short-term bills hit a 6-year high. Yields on 26-week bills rose to 4.737 percent and the average return to investors on 13-week bills rose to 4.585 percent. These Treasury bills are purchased primarily by banks and large corporations.

Second. Short-term interest rates resumed an upward course along a broad front since the Federal Reserve Board boosted the discount rate to 4½ percent last December 5. Large New York City, Chicago, and west coast banks are offering 4.875 percent on certificates of deposit of 180 days and longer.

Third. GMAC and International Harvester increased their rate on 180- to 270-day paper to 4⅞ percent.

Mr. Speaker, because of all of these events, I am urging the President and the Secretary of the Treasury to increase interest rates on Treasury savings bonds to the maximum limit of the President's power, but in any event to at least 4 percent.

Historic Fort San Lorenzo, Canal Zone: Rehabilitation Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the oldest fortifications still under the control of the United States is historic Fort San Lorenzo, located in the Canal Zone on a cliff at the mouth of the Chagres River. Completed in 1597, this fort has long served as the guardian of this strategic river in both peace and war, and has experienced both siege and shock.

It was gratifying to read a news story in the October 29, 1965, issue of the Star & Herald, Panama, R.P., that this ancient fortification is to be rehabilitated through a joint effort of Boy Scouts from the Canal Zone and Panama.

In order that all agencies of our Government may know of this worthy project, I quote the indicated news story:

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, R.P., Oct. 29, 1965]

PANAMA AND ZONE UNITS JOIN IN REHABILITATION PROJECT

Historic Fort San Lorenzo, one of the Isthmus of Panama's most outstanding archeological treasures, will be the site of a joint Panamanian-United States rehabilitation project beginning Saturday.

Rover Scouts of Panama and their Canal Zone counterparts, the Explorer Scouts, will begin cleaning vegetation which has been obscuring many parts of the centuries-old fortifications.

Tools for clearing brush and transportation to the site will be provided by Atlantic side units of U.S. Army Forces Southern Command (USARSO). Scouts from Panama City and the Pacific side of the Canal Zone will leave on the train from Ancon Station at 8:10 a.m. Saturday, Rover Scouts from Colon will join them there to work on the project.

The improvement project was conceived by Maj. Gen. J. D. Alger, USARSO commander, and endorsed by Panama's National Commission of Archeology and Historical Monuments.

In a letter to General Alger, Dr. Reina Torres de Araúz, Commission chairman, wrote: "I would like to congratulate you for such a laudable project which represents an inestimable historical value. Also, I would like to advise you that this Commission is ready to cooperate at all times with this project."

Dr. Araúz also expressed her appreciation of the general's assurance that all artifacts unearthed not used in the rehabilitation will be delivered to the custody of Panama's National Museum. It is expected that during a later stage of the project, volunteer Army divers will search for items of historical value in the waters at the foot of the promontory on which the old fort stands.

Technical assistance will come later from Dr. Hale Smith, head of the department of anthropology and archeology of Florida State University. He recently inspected the ruins of Fort San Lorenzo and prepared an outline of useful activities which the Panamanian and U.S. scouts will begin next Saturday.

Coordinating the participation of Panama's Rover Scouts is Dr. Teodoro Arias, a well-known physician. Ted G. Kellogg, Canal Zone Scout Executive and Lt. Col. Donald E. Gray are representing the Canal Zone and U.S. Army-sponsored Scouts, respectively.

The project will be under the overall supervision of Hugh H. Gardner, USARSO staff historian.

Groups of scouts will work at the fort each Saturday for an indefinite period. As work progresses over the months, more complex restoration work is planned with the help of USARSO soldiers who possess the needed skills.

Fort San Lorenzo, completed in 1597, once was one of the most important fortifications in the New World. Overlooking the Caribbean Sea at the mouth of the Chagres River, it guarded a vital point in the flow of goods back and forth across the isthmus.

Boats loaded with manufactured goods from Europe traveled up the Chagres to the town of Cruces, about halfway across Panama to the Pacific Ocean. Here the goods were transferred to mule trains and carried to Panama City.

On the return trip, mules laden with the riches of western South America went from Panama City to Cruces. Here the shipments were transferred to boats which returned down the river to the town of Chagres, guarded by Fort San Lorenzo. The gold of the Incas was stored in warehouses here while awaiting shipment to Spain.

The fort was sacked by Henry Morgan's pirates in 1670, but was rebuilt by Spain.

A Preposterous Jobless Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner and News-Call Bulletin of January 9 is, in my opinion, a fair and honest description of the terms contained in H.R. 8282 if it is presented to the House on the same manner as presented to the Ways and Means Committee. The editorial follows:

A PREPOSTEROUS JOBLESS PAY BILL

The congressional hopper has an unemployment compensation bill, due for consideraton this month, that is far removed from its purported objective.

Unemployment compensation, as originally and almost universally accepted, has a legitimate purpose. That is to bridge the payless gap between jobs of a worker unemployed through no fault of his own.

Nobody quarrels with that principle any more. Most States have the necessary laws. Industry and employers fully support the system. Millions of jobless have been helped over the rough spots of involuntary unemployment. Improvements in the system have been made as experience indicated necessity for them.

But the presently contemplated legislation runs roughshod over all experience.

It would compensate not just workers who lost jobs, but those who voluntarily quit, those properly discharged for misconduct and those who refuse to accept suitable reemployment.

These are preposterous departures from concepts of compensation for unemployment.

They would not merely tide over the jobless.

They would underwrite the shiftless and incompetent.

They would board the indolent, the shirkers, and the parasites at the table of the taxpayers.

One consequence would be a doubling of State unemployment insurance costs within 5 years.

Another and worse consequence would be diversion of the resources of the unemployment compensation system to malingerers to the detirment of the deserving unemployed. The prime function of unemployment compensation should be to sustain a jobless family until the breadwinner can do it.

The system now proposed would not be insurance against unemployment. It would not be welfare in any conscionable sense. It would be a system of handouts, a place the trough.

Gold and the Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, again this year we must address ourselves to the international balance-of-payments problem and, more specifically, to the question of what positive steps can be taken by the United States to deal with it.

It has been my position for some time that the United States should have a gold policy which does not protect speculators from loss.

In that connection, the Honorable Sherman J. Maisel, member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, made a valuable contribution to the study of this problem in a Dallas speech last November 11 entitled, "Interest Rates, Gold, and the Balance of Payments."

In that speech, Governor Maisel noted that we have already taken several steps to deal with the problem, including the interest equalization tax and the voluntary foreign credit restraint program. He noted, too, that some progress has been made toward a reconsideration of our income tax policy with respect to foreign earnings.

> Another major improvement—

Said Governor Maisel—

> aimed particularly at speculative, short-term money flows, which have had a most destabilizing effect, has been promised by the advocates of widening the margin of permissible limits of exchange rate variation. They claim that broader limits would cut our short-term speculative capital outflow since the costs of covering forward would exceed

the small interest differentials which now lead to capital exports. Trade would not be influenced, since it would still take place either in dollars or at agreed upon exchange rates.

Governor Maisel then said, and I emphasize this particularly—

They have suggested that we broaden the limits by widening our gold margins. This would have to be done by lowering the purchase price of gold, since we have a firm national commitment to maintain the selling price at $35 an ounce. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently urged a much closer examination of this proposal.

Governor Maisel agrees that a study of the pros and cons of this type of proposal would be worthwhile.

As a further contribution to our study and understanding of this entire problem, I ask leave to include at this point in my remarks two editorials published in the Washington Post, December 10 and December 11, 1965.

A Positive Program—I

By restricting the outflow of dollars the administration may undermine this country's position of leadership and inhibit the growth of the world economy. If the balance-of-payments problem is ever to be solved and the dangers of a worldwide stagnation averted, the negative strategy of responding to attacks on the dollar with counterproductive restrictions must be replaced by a positive program.

Although the fact seems only dimly perceived, the United States is the world's banker. Dollars provide the means for conducting most of the world's international trade. And with more than $80 billion in overseas investments, this country has been the principal source of capital funds for both developed and underdeveloped nations.

But since the late 1950's the United States has not behaved as a banker should. Growing banks actively seek to attract more deposits. But the U.S. Government has been saying to its foreign "depositors"—the central banks, importers and others who hold dollars—"please, please, don't cash your dollars in for gold." And the foreign dollar holders react very much as domestic bank depositors would if they were asked not to demand cash. They become restive about holding large dollar claims even though the purchasing power of the dollar has held up much better than that of gold, and even though short-term dollar securities, unlike gold, earn interest.

The alarm which has caused this country to embrace protectionist policies in an effort to stop the outflow of capital funds does not stem from the weakness of the dollar. If the dollar were really weak it would not be widely held as a reserve currency; and there would be a massive flight of capital from this country. Instead of that, $24 billion is now held by foreigners. What impels the Government to adopt unwise and unworkable policies is the fear that the gold stock will be depleted.

The policymakers reason that by eliminating the payments deficit they will protect the gold stock and at the same time force the Europeans to agree to a reform of the international monetary system that would presumably solve the dollar deficit problem. But those hopes rest on a fragile base. The gold thirst that caused France to cash in more than $747 million in the first 9 months of this year is rooted in politics, not economics. There is, then, little reason to hope that an agreement can be reached on a workable scheme for monetary reform. And if there were an agreement, it is unlikely that the new or reformed mechanism would be capable of creating reserves on the scale that would be necessary to finance deficits of the size incurred by this country.

Rather than pin hopes on ill-defined or defective proposals for international monetary reform, the United States as the world's banker should focus on the immediate problem of devising an arrangement that will make it more attractive for foreigners to hold dollars and riskier for them to hold gold. Such a plan will be outlined in another editorial.

A Positive Program—II

Instead of encouraging foreigners to hold more dollars and less gold, the policies of the United States produce the opposite effect.

By supporting the gold price within the narrow limits of 8¾ cents, plus or minus one-fourth percent on either side of the parity price of $35 an ounce, the United States encourages those who expect that the dollar will be devalued through a rise in the Treasury's gold price. It is as if Americans, who are not permitted to buy or hold gold within this country, were assured that the Government would support the stock of the (mythical) Tasmoc Corp. to within one-fourth percent of its par value. If the supply of Tasmoc shares were more or less fixed, holders would be extremely reluctant to part with them except at very high prices. And so it is with gold. So long as its price is not permitted to fall much below $34.91 per ounce, those who are betting on an increase have an almost certain, one-way option.

Suppose, however, that the United States were to widen the gold margins by 10 percent on either side of parity so that the gold price were permitted to fluctuate between $31.50 and $38.50 an ounce. Within that range, 40 times as wide as the present one, gold holders, fearing a substantial drop in the price, would tend to sell whenever the upper margin was approached.

A more freely functioning gold market, by making hoarding very risky, would provide strong protection for the U.S. gold stock. With a high price the Treasury gold stock would go farther in settling dollar claims. A low price would favor those countries that held on to their dollars. Increases in the price of gold by this market route would not involve a devaluation since the exchange rates between the dollar and other currencies need not be affected.

In fact one of the principal objects of widening the gold margins is to preserve the system of fixed exchange rates between national currencies. Business has a well founded preference for fixed exchange rates—for the assurance that the dollar price of francs or the franc price of pounds sterling will not widely fluctuate from day to day. But the system of fixed exchange rates cannot survive if the United States, as the world's banker, is subjected to blackmailing threats on its stock of gold. Wider gold margins would place a price tag on the threats that the Europeans can now make at no cost to themselves. And there would be more far-reaching consequences if cooperation in maintaining a system of wider gold points were not forthcoming.

Suppose that France and other countries, dissatisfied with the wide gold margins, decided to peg their currencies to gold—rather than to the dollar as they do now—and established narrow gold margins of their own. There would then be a "franc bloc" and a "dollar bloc" that would be linked by flexible exchange rates.

If the franc bloc countries dumped their dollars to buy gold, their currencies would appreciate—become more expensive in relation to the dollar. And with appreciated currencies, the balance-of-payments surplus of the franc bloc—if there were one—would soon be eliminated as their exports slumped and imports swelled. Conversely if the dollar bloc were in surplus and the franc bloc in deficit, purchases by the franc bloc would soon cause the dollar to appreciate.

Unlike any of the proposals for international monetary reform, the widening of the gold points can be effected by a simple majority of votes in the International Monetary Fund. And this country could easily carry the issue under the system of weighted voting.

The administration's defensive policies point toward worldwide stagnation, the proliferation of protectionist measures and the ultimate breakdown of the international monetary system. Widening the gold margins offers a very real hope of reversing those dangerous trends and permitting this country to perform its functions as the world's banker.

Address by Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address by Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, before the 1965 Biennial Convention of the Maritime Trade Department, AFL–CIO at San Francisco, Calif., on December 7, 1965:

Remarks of Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, Before the 1965 Biennial Convention of the Maritime Trades Department, AFL–CIO, at San Francisco, December 7, 1965

It is a distinct honor to have been invited, by your president, Paul Hall, to appear at this biennial convention of the maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. Only 6 months ago I had the pleasure of speaking, also at Mr. Hall's invitation, at the Seamen's International Union Convention in Washington, D.C., and I can assure you that as one who formerly held union membership, and as one who appreciates the benefits that organized labor has conferred upon our entire society, I feel very much at home talking with the delegates of men organized in the furtherance of our noble maritime callings.

All of you will agree, I am sure, that this is a memorable date. Only 24 years ago today, December 7, 1941, a day of ignominous infamy, Americans were called upon to show their mettle, and in the ensuing 4 years the world witnessed the greatest example of the harnessing of resolve and ability that has ever been known. And you of the maritime trades, all too frequently subjected to "pork barrel" attacks, are entitled to especial plaudits from the entire free world, for there was not only no work stoppage or slow down in your trades during those awesome times, but a record of self-sacrificing, wholehearted dedication which enabled the American merchant marine and American shipbuilding to offer the free world the logistic wherewithal which was absolutely essential to successfully prosecute the war. In the immediate postwar years, your still unstinted efforts contributed to the rehabilitation of the free world which enabled the continuation of Western culture.

Historically, American shipping has been seemingly put upon and, sadly, cast aside as the cycles of peril and security have been interpreted by men of short memory and convenient economy. As President Johnson stated in referring to the contributions made by those engaged in maritime matters, "International commerce and the ships which make it possible, have contributed immeasurably to America's greatness. The seas and ships and seafaring men are an integral part of this country's past, present, and future."

And Congressman JOHN ROONEY, an astute observer of Government spending, especially in the maritime field, has said, "Our country has gotten much more out of the merchant marine than the merchant marine ever got out of the country."

I wholeheartedly subscribe to these statements and agree that we can ill afford to neglect our merchant marine, particularly at this point in history.

So today is a signal day for me, on behalf of seafaring men, to call to the attention of our countrymen your devotion to Nation not only in peace and in war, in international hostility, but in worldwide commercial rejuvenation, as well.

The position of our Nation as the leader of the free world, the size and potential power of the uncommitted world, together with our commercial preeminence as a trading nation, apart from the aspects of national defense, seem to cry out for the continuation, even the escalation of our ability to build, maintain, service, and operate ships. Consequently, your arts and skills which our Republic has found to be so essential at each and every crisis which our Nation has faced, must be preserved and nurtured.

Almost everyone in this country, I suspect, is aware that these are critical times for the American merchant marine, American shipbuilding, their related industries, and for American wage earners who, particularly in times of national peril, make these industries so efficient. And the debates centering about various remedies offered to cure shipping ills have virtually embroiled the entire Nation. So it is with some wonderment that I meet the realization that many people throughout the land—and I include people in shipping and related circles—assume that the Federal Maritime Commission has a role to play in the maintenance of an adequate U.S.-flag fleet, the administration of cargo-preference laws, vessel construction programs, vessel manning scales, and even safety of life at sea.

While I am sure that no one here labors under that misapprehension, nevertheless, I would like to take this opportunity to state, albeit briefly, the functions and responsibilities of the Commission. As you know, the Commission was created in 1961, when the old Federal Maritime Board was abolished. The 1961 reorganization vested all regulatory responsibilities, primarily economic in nature, in the Commission, and left to the Maritime Administration, an agency within the Department of Commerce, the promotional responsibilities for maintaining a strong American merchant marine pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. We all are aware of the truly difficult promotional problems that labor, industry, and the Government are faced with, and are familiar with the dedicated, if nevertheless diverse, efforts championed by various interests to come to grips with these enormous challenges.

The Commission, by reason of its enabling act, is not involved in these matters per se. I do not mean to imply, of course, that we do not have vexing maritime problems of our own. Basically, the Commission administers the Shipping Act and the Intercoastal Shipping Act. The Intercoastal Shipping Act empowers us to regulate common carriers in our off-shore domestic trades, terminal operators, and freight forwarders. Under this mandate, while we do not license carriers, as do the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, we do have very broad powers over the carrier's level of rates and practices, and under it we license freight forwarders not on the basis of convenience or necessity but under standards of fitness, and we oversee the operations of terminal operators, generally, on the basis of fairness.

Under the Shipping Act, the Commission exercises authority over carriers and conferences of carriers in our foreign trades. By far the lion's share of our work, and the more complex, delicate challenges, arise under this act. In carrying out its responsibilities under the Shipping Act, the Commission does not regulate as to flag. American- and foreign-flag vessels enjoy like privileges, and each must measure up to the same standards of conduct. This fact seems surprising to many, but I feel that it should be understood readily when it is realized that the Commission does not regulate common carriers except in their posture as necessary instruments for American international commerce. In a very real sense, it may be said that one of the essential reasons for the Commission's existence is the obligation to insure that American exporters and importers are treated fairly by the carriers and conferences of carriers which they must rely on to conduct their business. This obligation of the Commission was plainly strengthened by amendments to the act in 1961, which require the filing of their tariffs by carriers covering both import and export rates, and by requiring that such rates may be charged. These statutory requirements have resulted in shippers and consignees being able to establish, before they ship, exactly what their freight costs will be and, more importantly, in knowing what their competitors must pay for transportation. The difficult problems stemming from rate disparities which are most onerous for our export commerce, should be eased somewhat after January, when under our new General Order 13, inbound tariffs—as well as outbound—will be required to be filed in a particular form and manner. The economic strides now being made by our foreign competitors make it difficult enough for our exporters to lay down their goods in foreign marketplaces. Unjustified rates which saddle American exporters with an unwarranted burden simply cannot be tolerated. The Commission has been wrestling with this problem long and hard, and I mention it here only as an example of the fact that we too have trying issues before us, and to demonstrate the different responsibilities cast upon the Commission as compared to those of other departments and agencies. And we all agree that these problems must be satisfactorily solved for the benefit of all.

While you will be addressed here in convention by many other men from various walks of life with different obligations, I thought I would leave the maritime promotional field to those entrusted with that prime responsibility. I thought, however, that for a few moments we might all reflect on the responsibilties of delegates in the labor movement and your responsibility to the rank and file. And the historical development of labor philosophy, what your predecessors in the labor movement have gained for you and your members and what goals you are attempting to attain.

Labor unions have been organized to help each individual man or member to better his conditions.

I need not remind you of the great foundation laid down in former centuries and even enunciated in the Bible from which much of our 20th century labor philosophy stems. "By the sweat of thy brow thou shalt earn thy bread," Genesis 3: 19. To labor is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purposes of life which most importantly is self-preservation.

A man's labor bears two notes or characters. First of all, it is personal, since the exertion of individual strength belongs to the individual who puts it forth. Secondly, man's labor is necessary; for without the result of labor he cannot live. Self-preservation is a law of nature, which must be obeyed. The labor of the workingman is not only his personal attribute, but it is necessary; and this makes all the difference, because the preservation of life is the bounden duty of one and all. It follows, then, that each man has the right to procure what is required in order to live, and the workingman can procure it only through work and wages.

While it may be assumed that workingman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, even regarding wages, nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, that the laborer's remuneration ought to be sufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage earner. If through inequitable circumstances, the workingman must accept harsh conditions or insufficient wages because an employer will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, the role of labor unions is absolutely essential, and in order to supersede Government intervention, to safeguard the interests of the wage earner, good faith labor-management administration must result in justice and equity for all.

Unless I miss the mark, your own serious deliberations here involve an assessment of your own past, an analysis of the present state of your affairs and a careful prognosis of the foreseeable future. You have, as have all of organized labor, much to be proud of. Apart from your contributions to national defense, your tenacious persistence has given our people the highest standard of living in the world. And your obligations as you discharge them not only here in convention, but in the daily conduct of your affairs, affects the warp and woof of our entire economy.

First of all you representatives of your fellow workingmen are in the nature of personal fiduciaries. Whatever you do, or do not do, directly affects the ability of your members to live in the dignity to which they are entitled. Thus your responsibility to them is one of the highest trust.

It is no longer revolutionary to urge, as it was when Pope Leo XIII stated it in 1891, in the encyclical "Rerum Novarum," that working conditions which unduly endanger health and safety cannot be tolerated and that wages, due to the inherent dignity of man, must be such as to keep him and his family in reasonable comfort. Today, however, new economic dangers pose unknown threats to the well being and security of workingmen, and these dangers loom particularly large for Americans in the maritime trades. Consequently, by the exercise of your obligations, you must act justly and wisely, in order to give to your members that degree of leadership and protection to which they are entitled. Yet your actions must not be such as to let short-term benefits result in longrun ruination. Good faith efforts must be made to accommodate, with as little human dislocation as possible, new and improved methods of carrying on business. For if the steamship, the terminal, or the shipbuilding industries cannot keep apace in this fast moving competitive world, by dovetailing the more efficient methods of operation with the workingman's right to earn a living and enjoy his natural dignity, there well may be no jobs to protect and no profits to be earned. But I do not envision the enlightened leadership of the labor movement in this country today to blindly cast aside its obligations any more than it has cast aside its opportunities. As some evidence of responsible labor statesmanship, I want to quote an accolade from the current issue of the First National City Bank of New York's monthly economic letter:

"Through most of the late forties and fifties, wages rose at a considerably faster pace than productivity, and unit labor costs rose accordingly. In the last 4-year period, not only have productivity gains been greater than in earlier periods, but wage increases have been somewhat less than earlier and more nearly in line with productivity gains."

The problems now facing the maritime industries, of course, also, in different forms, confront labor. It may very well be said that maritime arts and skills have reached a crossroads. But reasonable men must postulate that, as a nation, we need a force of maritime skills and that we cannot afford to permit these skills to atrophy. As technology advances, socioeconomic concern must keep pace. And this requires a firm voice on the part of labor in the counsels of direction. Pope John XXIII, in his enclyclical "Mater et Magistra," in 1961, recognizing that industries undergo "sudden and profound changes" stated: "workers should be allowed to play an active part in the affairs of an enterprise" and pointed out that, "those who are daily involved in an enterprise must not be reduced to the level of mere silent performers"; concluding "it is appropriate and necessary that, besides the holders of capital or their representatives, the workers also, or those who represent their rights, demands and aspirations, should have some place in such authorities or institutions."

Those who would deny labor's place in management counsels ignore not only natural justice and betray the concept of man's universal dignity, but they also deny the lessons of history. Labor has always been the well spring of prosperity, and organized labor has facilitated the distribution of wealth.

All of your deliberations, I am sure, will be tempered by your historical and well known, if not publicized, sense of duty: First to your members to whom you owe the highest obligation, secondly to the industry of which you are a most essential element, and thirdly, to the common good, to the public interest, if you will, whereby this Nation will prosper politically and socially, and will lead the world to an era of enlightened peace.

In closing, I wish you the very best of success in your convention and trust that from it will come meaningful guides, not only for your own undertakings, but for the assistance of our necessary maritime industries.

How Educational Broadcasters Can Enslave Commercial Broadcasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE R. POOL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following keynote speech, "How Educational Broadcasters Can Enslave Commercial Broadcasters," by Mr. Gordon B. McLendon of station KLIF in Dallas, Tex. The speech was the keynote address before the 22d convention of the National Honorary Radio and Television Fraternity in Houston last year, and was distributed throughout the entire broadcasting industry. In my opinion, it represents a constructive approach to the needs of educational broadcasters:

HOW EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS CAN ENSLAVE COMMERIAL BROADCASTERS

(By Gordon B. McLendon)

I am honored to make the keynote address at this 22d convention of the National Honorary Radio and Television Fraternity.

I am quite aware that many of you here tonight are educators and many more will be. All of you share my devotion to radio and television.

With each rising sun, the role of the educational broadcaster becomes more important. The careful watch kept by the Federal Communications Commission has made all thoughtful radio broadcasters more cognizant of their service responsibilities in educational programming. And the growing educational television industry—and it is an industry—is ever more powerful in its influence upon those who wish to learn.

And yet, educational broadcasters continue to miss their greatest opportunities for advancement. What if, for instance, you in educational broadcasting could make the most powerful commercial radio and television stations in your city your determined and aggressive allies? What if the commercial stations affirmatively promoted your programs on their airwaves, offered you constant assistance, and regarded you as a clear ally rather than, passively, regarding you as something a Federal agency required that one offer lip service?

There is a way. And thus the title of this speech: "How Educational Broadcasters Can Help Commercial Broadcasters."

In that title is the secret of making commercial stations your slave. Whatsoever ye sow, that shall ye also reap. If one takes off life's conveyor belt, he must put back on in equal measure. What you want from commercial broadcasting operations, you must be prepared to return in kind.

But nonprofit, educational broadcasters have largely missed this richly rewarding experience in quid pro quo. You in educational broadcasting are frequently calling upon commercial operations for help of all sorts—sometimes money, or support for a fund-raising program, sometimes equipment, sometimes promotion, sometimes advice—but, whatever, constantly seeking the help and support of commercial operators. Not infrequently, we are asked by you for editorial support in a project important to educational broadcasters. Almost weekly, in all of the markets in which we operate, we are asked for help by one or another educational institution. To quote a famous comic, "a friend in need is a pest." But to put it more correctly, a friend in need who receives and does not return, quickly becomes a crashing bore.

Is this a one-way street? What have you offered in return? What have you put back on the conveyor belt? What have you done for or offered to commercial broadcasters to create a debt of gratitude from them? What have you sown? Let us now retitle our speech tonight; "How The Educational Broadcaster Can Enslave the Commercial Broadcaster." It can be done. It is easy. It will work. Here is how to enslave us:

First of all, we commercial broadcasters are asked by the Federal Communications Commission to make periodic surveys of our community to determine the ways in which our stations may best serve not only the community to which we are licensed and the area which our signal serves—it is our obligation to discover that programing not being either offered at all, or inadequately offered, and that programing which is in surfeit and, further, it is our obligation to attempt to program ourselves accordingly. The FCC's survey requirement is a good one, at least for our stations, because we always learn much in taking these surveys.

Let me suggest that you begin your effort to enslave the commercial broadcaster, as students or teachers, by conducting a similar thoroughgoing survey of all commercial broadcasters in your area of service in an attempt to discover the needs of the commercial broadcasters and then assist them in fulfilling those needs to the best of your ability. This survey of management personnel, sales personnel, programing and engineering personnel will produce valuable information for you. Commercial stations will be flattered, appreciative, and, incidentally, amazed.

I can think of many questions for this survey of commercial station personnel:

1. What type of personnel do you particularly need?

2. Here, sir, is our course of study—what do you think is omitted?

3. How often have the personnel of our noncommercial station called on you to volunteer assistance, or ask if there was anything we could do for you?

4. Do you think we in educational broadcasting should editorialize?

5. What issues do you think we should editorialize upon?

6. What information are you receiving about our station or communications or speech department?

7. What information would you like to receive?

8. If we provide you with releases, is it possible to set up a definite schedule of newscasts on which they will be heard?

9. How often, sir, do you listen to or watch our station?

10. Which programs do you enjoy or appreciate the best?

11. Would you be willing to cross-plug some of our programs if we cross-plug some of yours?

12. Can we set up some sort of specific schedule of cross-plugs right now?

13. Have you ever visited our station, sir?

14. Could we set up an exact time now for your visit?

15. Have you any spare equipment—however small? Would you ask your chief engineer to check? I will write you a reminder.

16. In which of your public service projects do you think we might assist?

17. Have you any commercial accounts you think our students could assist you with—for instance, by making surveys or by attempting to create attractive commercials? Don't think you won't get his attention there.

18. Do you need any market or other research data our educational staff could help you gather?

19. Would you like us to send certain of our personnel to work for you 2 hours each week at no cost to you?

20. Could we set up a specific schedule of their work hours right now?

21. Have you any on-the-air audience promotions in which we might consider a cooperative effort?

22. Do you have need for first-ticket announcers? Can we train first-ticket men for you?

23. In the field of news, are there newsstories about our school's activities which you would like to have our department or station feed to your news department?

24. Could you feed us any local newsstories? Under what circumstances?

25. Would you be willing, at your studios, to answer questions from our students for 1 hour each month? Could we set up definite times and dates right now?

Now, these 25 questions are only the beginning. Now that you've made up your mind to put it back on the belt, you should be able to think of all sorts of questions to help you determine how you can help the commercial broadcaster and how he can help you. And he will help you if you help him. Don't be discouraged if he doesn't reciprocate all your kindnesses the first few times. Kill him with kindness—embarrass him. And if one or two commercial operators fail to return your efforts at assistance, don't flinch—the others will not disappoint you. Keep plugging—everybody will be astounded at your persistence. And remember that where one or two operators don't show reciprocity, this is good, too—you've learned who to work with and who not to work with. It's like your friends—it takes a while to separate the producers from the nonproducers and the friends from the mere close acquaintances. Get ready to be disappointed in some of them. More important, get ready for one of the greatest experiences of your life.

Now how do I further enslave the commercial broadcaster?

First, to begin with, call him often and write him often. Keep your calls and your letters short. But keep in steady contact.

Second, keep the commercial broadcasters' name on your airwaves—twice a month if possible. That'll keep his attention. How do you keep his name on the air? Well, what station doesn't have something it wants promoted or publicized on your station—news of expansion or earnings, or new personnel, or new programing. What new boards of directors has the manager joined? What success stories or humorous features has the program director to relate? What news stories can you carry and credit the name of a commercial station's newscaster? Names are your most precious weapon.

Third, ask your commercial broadcaster for permission occasionally to use his editorials as "guest editorials." Don't fail to use his call letters profusely.

Fourth, get your staff to monitor his station and put on regular public service announcements of your own, plugging those shows on his station which you believe would be of interest to your listeners.

Fifth, quite gratuitously, you can do a quantitative and even a qualitative survey of his listening audience and offer him, in confidence, the data for his particular station.

Sixth, you can call up once in a while simply to ask for advice. There's nothing quite so flattering as being asked for advice.

Seventh, don't be afraid of use other stations' call letters on your airwaves. We do it often. It causes comment and it creates good will.

Eighth, offer him some of your own station or departmental editorials for use on his commercial station.

Ninth, offer him music surveys showing musical preferences each week in your school.

Tenth, exercise your imagination. What can I do for this fellow broadcaster? And as a subdivision of this 10th point, we come to the most vital issue of all—the fact that in order to be effective in enslaving the commercial broadcaster you must regard and treat him as an equal—being neither condescending nor disdainful, even though you may be younger. Too many educational broadcasters seem to me to treat commercial broadcasters with too much respect. We're not that busy, or unavailable, or preoccupied. We can be had and I'm telling you the way to take us. That commercial broadcaster is a good fellow, most likely, like you are, but you won't have his respect if you are menial or demonstrate an inferiority complex. And, above all—we might call this point 11—you'll never perform at your maximum in the educational field if you feel that your life will end or that you will be fired if you make a single commercial broadcaster unhappy. I regret to say that, like any other business, we've got some real slobs in the commercial broadcasting business. There are a few you can't please no matter what you do—operators who hold their license ony because they have such a small audience that nobody even calls them to the attention of the FCC. You'll discover through experience who these operators are. Forget them—the public already has. And if you are still worried about the possibility of somehow not pleasing every commercial operator, simply go to your school's president in advance, present your plan of cooperation with commercial broadcasters, tell the president that he'll have an occasional letter of protest from some commercial station operator who either doesn't know what you are trying to do or feels he has been slighted in some regard. Chances are that when the president sees what you're going to do, he'll begin right then thinking of promoting you, and you certainly will have cut off any chance that some so-and-so may cause you trouble with a protest to the Board of Regents.

You cannot be bashful. You must be bold, although courteous. You must work. Above all, you must think. If you don't think, don't expect the other fellow to think of you.

Tonight, we've purposely ignored what the commercial station can do for you on the theory that you already know, or that you are capable of sitting down and listing all of the things you want and need from commercial broadcasters.

Now, in all likelihood, you won't do all these things I've suggested—you'll reject some, add others, and compromise on a few. Don't compromise on too many, though, for in the end there is no compromise with the truth.

And so that is my blueprint for enslaving the commercial broadcaster. I want to be enslaved. Those chains you use are only going to make the commercial operator more money, make his programs more listenable, and make him more responsive to the desires of his community and, again, simply make him money and, not quite incidentally, benefit the public. It's a simple equation: you, plus intelligent aid to the commercial broadcaster equals money for him, benefit to the public, and a magnificent career for you. The cost in dollars? Zero. The cost of your time and mental effort—considerable. Really, the question is what you are worth to yourself—how highly do you regard yourself? How much do you care what becomes of you?

In the very end, I must say to you that I have a selfish purpose in this address tonight. As the father of four and the grandfather of two, I am ever more conscious of the training of young people. Being so conscious, I can only think of what radio meant in my own early years. When I was a boy, I played baseball and I dreamed youthful dreams of legendary players and leaping, twisting catches made by fielders who jumped higher than the wall itself, and I dreamed of bleachers baking in the summer sun and of huge green fences—so high it seemed that no little boy could ever climb them. And with these wonderful childhood dreams, I listened so intensely on my old Majestic radio, to the great radio sportscasters of those years which seem so long ago—Ted Husing, Graham McNamee, Bill Stern, great names—fraught with the memory of giants. My childish mind was their clay, and they will never know to what extent they molded that mind. And now I find myself here tonight, a veteran of many summers in radio, with many of my great childhood teachers gone. The old days are gone and will not return. But, like a life reborn, a new world opens for me—for today my son nears 19 and he, as a fine young athlete, dreams of high and unscalable green walls and pitches so fast and terrible and twisting that no catcher can hold them. He also listens to the radio and watches the television and memorizes the great sports columnists and from them dreams his own magnificent visions and it is his mind that is now so much your responsibility. My days with him will soon be over, and I turn him over to you who will be the radio and television and journalistic leaders of tomorrow. Yours is an enormous challenge, and excitement beyond your own dreams, and you might well smile in the anticipation of all of the wonderful days that are going to be. And it is to you, his associates and his teachers of tomorrow, that I commit one of my most priceless possessions—my son. Be kind.

Idaho Travel Promotion Program Wins Best-in-Nation Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, Idaho is a small State, but it is rich in natural resources—and it is rich in resourceful people.

Idaho, two-thirds of which is owned by government, must necessarily operate on a limited budget because the Congress, in its wisdom, has not seen fit to pass "payments-in-lieu-of-taxes" legislation. What Idahoans can accomplish on a limited budget is dramatically illustrated in the following press release which tells of a high award won by the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development.

I am proud of Idaho—I am proud of its commerce and development department—I am proud of Miss Shadduck—and I am proud to be an Idahoan.

The release follows:

IDAHO TRAVEL PROMOTION PROGRAM WINS BEST-IN-NATION AWARD

For doing a big job with a little budget the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development has won the special award of merit for outstanding achievement in travel and tourist promotion. Presentation of the award was a highlight of a ceremony in Dallas on November 14 at the 25th annual U.S. Travel Conference of the National Association of Travel Organizations and was received by Louise Shadduck, head of the winning Idaho department.

Officially stated, the award was made "to the Idaho Department of Commerce and Development for its promotional efforts in the State's sharpshooting tradition, to make a little budget do a big job, mutliplying its tourist income fourfold in 10 years by careful, selective planning."

In evaluating Idaho's qualifications, the awards committee considering that the Idaho department avoids being overwhelmed by the advantages of its many supersized competitors in the tourist and travel fields, gaining objectives which can be won sensibly with the means at its disposal.

Giving credit to a staff that is always willing to make extra efforts to gain added results for Idaho's taxpayers and to the thousands of Idahoans whose devotion and support have made the overall success possible, Miss Shadduck said: "Idaho is an excellent product to sell and we stick to that purpose. We avoid using material which can be mistaken for anything but Idaho."

NECESSITY BECOMES AN ADVANTAGE

"Our staff consists of only 10 persons. So we make the personal touch an ideal. We have to make it work. Rotating jobs and assignments, covering several bases, is a must for our staff and I certainly am happy that their work has gained national recognition. Their record deserves it. All share in meeting the public and in guiding visiting travel editors and television and movie production staffs who so often work in our State.

"Further, our advantage in having Idaho to sell is enhanced by the cooperation we get from Idaho's people (the Basque Dancers are a good example) clubs, organizations, and individuals have helped make Idaho more famous coast to coast and from small affairs to the world fairs. It was just this cooperation too, that tilted the balance in bringing Idaho the National Girl Scout Senior Roundup and the Boy Scout World Jamboree, two outstanding national and international recognitions right in succession."

Coast Guard Rescue Activities in 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the press recently carried reports of the Coast Guard's rescue activities during the year 1965, including the fact that more than 15,000 persons had been rescued in various operations in all parts of the country. Although we are aware of these operations of the Coast Guard, it is well worth recalling them, emphasizing the heroic deeds of the men in the service, and expressing our appreciation to them.

I am pleased to insert into the RECORD two articles published in the New York Times and the New London (Conn.) Day dealing with this subject, as well as an editorial in the Day commenting on the Coast Guard's activities.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1966]

Coast Guard Saved 15,000 During 1965

The Coast Guard has just closed the books on 1965, which, according to Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commandant, turned out to be one of the biggest lifesaving years in the service's 175-year history.

Outstanding in the service's far-flung activities which ranged from Saigon to Shreveport and from the Kara Sea to Cuba last year, he said, were these accomplishments.

The rescue of more than 15,000 persons.

The saving of close to $1.9-billion in property, or more than four times the Coast Guard's annual appropriation.

The first comprehensive oceanographic study of the Kara and Barents Seas north of the Soviet Union.

Active duty in Vietnamese waters for 17 of the service's 82-foot patrol boats.

FOCUS ON THE SOUTH

The launching of the 378-foot cutter *Hamilton*, the first of a new "Secretary" class of vessels, a high-endurance cutter with many advanced features.

The southern part of the United States and its offshore waters became the service's most active sector as a result of the Cuban exodue, Hurricane Betsy, and the springtime Mississippi floods, Admiral Roland noted.

Beginning in September hundreds of small craft, most of them unsuited to operate in the treacherous Florida Straits, began making their way between the U.S. mainland and the Cuban fishing port of Camarioca to transport Cuban emigrants to this country.

Working around the clock the Coast Guard aided about 3,000 persons in an operation reminiscent of the "matchbox fleet" which plucked nearly 1,700 Allied soldiers out of the English Channel during the Normandy invasion in World War II.

WIDE RANGE OF TASKS

When Hurricane Betsy slammed into Louisiana, 11 Coast Guard helicopters were called upon to evaculate 1,144 persons. Small boats and vehicles evacuated 3,600 more hurricane victims and transported about 100 tons of food, water, and medical supplies.

At its New Orleans supply depot the Coast Guard helped to bring more than 8,000 persons from flooded areas to high ground.

In the spring about 800 rescues took place on the rain-swollen Mississippi River. In one case Coast Guardsmen herded buffalo to safety, and in another, helped parents salvage their children's Easter baskets.

The Coast Guard icebreaker *Northwind*, Admiral Roland said, conducted a 5-month study of the little-known Kara and Barents Seas north of Russia.

For the first time, he added, scientists had an opportunity to secure important data on the nature, structure, and history of this remote part of the world.

As for new floating equipment to be added to the service's aging fleet, the year saw the launchings of one 210-foot medium-endurance cutter, three new 157-foot buoy tenders and the 378-foot *Hamilton*.

On the other side of the world, in war-torn Vietnam, the 17 Coast Guard patrol boats were used to help choke off the flow of supplies by water from North Vietnam to Vietcong units in the south.

Admiral Roland said the boats gave a good account of themselves in action against the enemy, sinking several Vietcong junks and supporting ground action by South Vietnam and U.S. troops.

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Jan. 4, 1966]

More Than 15,000 Persons Rescued by Coast Guard During Busy 1965

The Coast Guard in 1965 saved or rescued more than 15,000 persons, Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commandant, said today.

The value of property saved was nearly $1.9 billion, or more than four times the Coast Guard's appropriation for the year, Roland added.

Contributing to the high total were the Cuban small boat exodus, Hurricane Betsy and the spring Mississippi floods, Roland said.

In the fall of 1965, Coast Guard air and surface units patrolling the Straits of Florida were confronted with a major emergency created by a heavy small boat exodus from Cuba which began shortly after Cuban Premier Fidel Castro announced a relaxation of his policy on migration from Cuba.

Hundreds of small craft of all types undertook the hazardous journey from the U.S. mainland to the small Cuban fishing port of Camarioca to pick up relatives. Most of them were unsuited to operation in the treacherous Florida Straits. Coast Guard aircraft, in cooperation with surface units, kept close watch over these waters, alert for any emergency.

The Coast Guard assisted about 3,000 persons in an operation reminiscent of the "matchbox fleet" which pulled nearly 1,700 allied soldiers out of the English Channel during the Normandy invasion of World War II.

Coast Guard rescue facilities were put to a stern test in September, when Hurricane Betsy slammed viciously into the southeast, centering her fury upon the New Orleans area.

By the time the storm had spent itself, 11 helicopters had evacuated 1,144 persons, transported 22 medicos and flown 140 sorties. They were assisted by units of the Navy, National Guard, Red Cross and local groups.

About 800 rescues took place during the disastrous floods in the spring of 1965 when the swollen Mississippi and its tributaries rampaged over the adjacent countryside, causing havoc in America's heartland.

Coast Guard helicopters and small boats labored tirelessly to bring stranded men, women, and children to safety. In one instance, Coast Guardsmen herded buffalo to safety, evacuated flood victims, transported workers, medicine, and food and helped parents salvage their children's Easter basket.

The Coast Guard, through its AMVER program, saved additional scores of persons last year. Utilizing this computerized search and rescue operation, centered in New York City, assistance was brought to many distressed ships and persons. In the summer, AMVER was extended to the Pacific Ocean area. Headquarters for the western phase of AMVER are in San Francisco, Calif.

In Vietnam, 17 of the Coast Guard's 82-foot patrol boats were on duty helping to choke off the flow of supplies by water from North Vietnam to Vietcong units in the south. They have a good account of themselves in action against the enemy, sinking several Vietcong junks and supporting ground action by South Vietnamese and U.S. troops.

As part of its expanding oceanographic program, the Cutter Northwind carried out a 5-month study of the little known Kara and Barents Seas north of the Soviet Union. The cutter carried marine scientists of the Coast Guard's Oceanographic Unit in Washington.

Under an agreement between the Navy and Treasury Department, five Navy icebreakers will be transferred to the Coast Guard. Effect of the transfer will be to make the Coast Guard, the chief icebreaking agency for the Government.

The agreement will be carried out over a 16-month period, having begun with the transfer of Edisto in October and to conclude with the transfer of the Navy icebreaker Burton Island in November.

Plans to modernize the surface fleet went ahead with the launching of the 210-foot medium endurance cutter *Active*, three new 157-foot buoy tenders, *Red Wood*, *Red Birch*, and *Red Beech*. In December, the Coast Guard launched its first new "Secretary" class cutter, the 378-foot *Hamilton*, a high-endurance cutter, incorporating many advanced features.

[From the New London (Conn.) Day, Jan. 4, 1966]

The Coast Guard's Year

The drama in the race last week when Coast Guard vessels from New London and Fishers Island engaged in a 7-hour operation after a 50-foot ketch foundered only underscores the remarkable record this rescue service compiled last year.

More than 15,000 persons were aided by the Coast Guard in 1965, figures compiled by Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commandant, show. They were seafarers trapped aboard disabled vessels, occupants of pleasure craft in trouble, men, women and children menaced by floods in the Midwest and violent storms on the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean.

But this is only part of the story. Coast Guardsmen are committed to war service off Vietnam and performed their missions with quiet valor. They saved an estimated $1.9 billion worth of property—more than 4 times the Coast Guard's annual appropriation.

A little known aspect of the Coast Guard's worldwide job was the 5-month oceanographic study of the Kara and Barents Seas, north of Russia. Remote, possibly dangerous, these areas needed to be plumbed, their characteristics made known.

And then there are the less picturesque assignments, part of the unremitting program to foster greater safety on the sea. Coast Guard "detectives" investigate accidents to find out what can be done to prevent them. Coast Guard "teachers," including members of the volunteer auxiliary, instruct small boat owners and inspect their craft and their safety equipment.

Semper Paratus is the Coast Guard's motto—always ready. To which might be added, anywhere.

Remarks of Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the Airline Finance and Accounting Conference of the Air Transport Association, Miami Beach, Fla., November 4, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in a speech recently at the Airline Finance and Accounting Conference of the Air Transport Association held in Miami Beach, Fla., the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, discussed his economic and sociological philosophy as well as the CAB's attitude toward airline earnings and passenger fares.

The CAB is charged with the responsibility of encouraging development of air transportation and regulating the industry and today the airline industry in the United States is unparalleled in terms of service to the public at the most economical cost. Also, the industry is prospering and thriving with profits at an alltime high.

Since air transportation is and will continue to be increasingly more vital to urban areas like Greater Miami and our entire Nation, Chairman Murphy's remarks are timely and significant. I am confident that all my colleagues are deeply interested in knowing the background and personal philosophy of the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, as well as learning about the Board's opinions, as it affects the public service and this important industry:

In the fall of 1937, President Franklin Roosevelt established an interdepartmental committee to develop comprehensive aeronautical legislation for him to recommend to the Congress. The chairman of the interdepartmental committee was the then Assistant Secretary of Commerce, J. Monroe Johnson.

The White House invited Senator Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to send a representative as an observer to the interdepartmental committee. Senator McKellar asked me to act as his representative for this purpose, and I did. At that time, I was a legislative draftsman in the office of the Senate legislative counsel.

The interdepartmental committee did develop a legislative proposal, which was recommended to the Congress early the following year and led to enactment of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. In the Senate, there were two bills. One introduced by Senator Harry Truman, which was the administration bill, was referred to the Committee on Inter-State Commerce. The other introduced by Senator Pat McCarran, was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Both these bills were reported by their respective committees. Eventually, the Senate considered and passed the McCarran bill.

In the House of Representatives, the administration bill was introduced by Congressman Clarence Lea, of California, chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and was referred to that committee. This bill was reported by the committee and passed by the House. The final product, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, was worked out by a conference committee as a compromise between the Senate and House bills.

As a legislative draftsman, I had the privilege of working with both Senate committees, with the House committee, and with the conference committee on this legislation. I was a member of a kind of staff team of six or eight people, including two brilliant young lawyers from the Treasury Department, who represented the administration—Stuart Tipton and George Neal. The group included another brilliant young lawyer who represented the Air Transport Association—Howard Westwood. I think Howard is writing a book about this and doing some research. I speak only from memory, but these are among the memories I prize very highly.

I think all of us who had any part in drafting that act, even a part as small as mine, can be proud of what we did. It has stood the test of time and experience. Most of its provisions have been carried forward into the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. The economic provisions of the 1938 act are virtually unchanged today.

Under this law, the industry has thrived and prospered. I won't burden you with the statistics about its growth—you know them better than I. Suffice it to say that this act, and the industry operating under the act, have been phenomenally successful in accomplishing the act's stated objective of encouraging the development of air transportation.

I would characterize the economic system the act prescribes as regulated private enterprise. Some may refer to it as Federal encroachment, which they deplore and would terminate—but at different stages. Some would deregulate the industry entirely—with freedom from regulation being matched by freedom of entry. They would scrap the present system of regulation altogether, in the belief that it does not serve the public interest well. I do not agree. I believe the law has worked too well to warrant casting it aside.

Others who decry Federal encroachment may have a different meaning. I suspect they might like to continue restrictions on entry into air transportation and have the deregulation apply only with respect to the way business is conducted by those who already have their certificates of public convenience and necessity. Frankly, I do not believe this is a viable economic or social proposition. If the Government limits competition in the industry by restricting freedom of entry, it has an inescapable obligation to the public to replace by regulation the protection it has taken away by limiting competition. I don't see how anyone could really believe you should have the one without the other.

Let me hasten to add that within this framework, I believe the degree of regulation should be held to the minimum that is necessary, and the area of freedom of action for private enterprise should be as large as possible. I abhor the idea of regulation for regulation's sake; I detest redtape; I chafe under restrictions; and I like to get along with people. On the other hand, when and where I believe regulatory action is really required in the public interest, I will consider that I have no alternative except to support the necessary action.

I say these things because I have noticed lately a certain amount of interest in my economic and sociological philosophy and I wish to be as helpful as I can in telling people what to expect.

Really, I'm something of a Pollyanna about all this. I believe that you and we working together can achieve the best of all worlds for everyone in the field of air transportation. In the long run, there is no conflict between the maximum public benefits and the maximum private benefits from the future growth and development of this industry. The industry can prosper most by providing the greatest possible public service.

I'm happy to say that I believe this philosophy of public service is held by the management of most of our air carriers. This is one of the most heartening things I have found in my work as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Some airline executives are quite frank in avowing their dedication to the public interest. Others seem a little reluctant to acknowledge that a hard-headed businessman might harbor such thoughts. Perhaps a few really put the almighty dollar ahead of everything else—but, thank goodness, they are only a few.

Even the airline executives who agree with our basic philosophy about public service and industry regulation will disagree with us from time to time about the application of that philosophy to particular circumstances. That is perfectly natural, entirely proper, and certainly to be expected. You have your responsibilities and we have ours. If the Civil Aeronautics Board agreed with you all the time, there would really be no reason for the existence of the Civil Aeronautics Board at all. Although, we find it necessary to disagree from time to time, I will accord to all of you, in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, full credit for honesty of purpose. I hope you will find it possible to do the same for me.

Twenty-seven years ago, when I was working on the Civil Aeronautics Act, I had little thought that I would end up here tonight talking to you as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is, if you will permit me to say so, a fascinating experience.

It happens that I came to this position at a time when the industry is in a very good condition. This is most fortunate, and I'm very happy about it. However, the industry's prosperity has made it necessary for the CAB to take a fresh look at some of its responsibilities. This is not because the CAB objects to profits; in fact, we are in favor of profits. Good earnings are better than poor earnings, and I see no reason why we should ever try to reduce earnings just for the sake of reducing them.

Such talk obscures the real issues. The real issues grow out of the fact that the law imposes on the CAB a duty, in fixing rates, to consider the need of the public for transportation at the lowest cost consistent with furnishing the service. To deal intelligently with these issues you must sooner or later get right down to arithmetic. But first we might try to provide a little policy background.

I have been asked many times in the past few months about the Board's attitude toward airline earnings and passenger fares. I always respond to this by saying what I'm going to say to you now. The best guide I know to the Board's attitude is to read what the Board has said in its opinions. This surprises some people and annoys others, and I doubt if very many ever actually go and read the Board's opinions. It's more sophisticated to get a line on the Board's thinking from almost any other source than what the Board itself says. Nevertheless, I stick to my story that the best way to learn the Board's views is to read what the Board says. My own statements here or elsewhere do not necessarily represent the views of the Board. I'm only one of five Members and the others are not bound by what I say.

So, I'm now going to read to you some from the Board's opinions.

A landmark in the field of fare regulation is the Board's opinion in the general passenger fare investigation, decided November 25, 1960 (32 CAB 291). In that case, the Board did not order any changes in fares, but it did establish some standards as guidelines for the regulation of fares.

First, the Board said the industry profit element should be regulated by the test of rate of return on investment. Then it found fair and reasonable rates of return to be: 10.25 percent for the big four domestic trunk carriers; 11.125 percent for the other domestic trunks; resulting in a weighted average for the domestic trunkline industry of 10.5 percent.

Then the Board spoke of something which seems to me to be forgotten all too often in discussions of rate regulation; namely, the requirements of the law itself, as follows: "* * * the Board is under statutory injunction in determining rates to consider such factors as: (1) the need in the public interest of adequate and efficient transportation of persons and property by air carriers at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of such service; (2) the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges; and (3) the need of each air carrier for revenue sufficient to enable such air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient management, to provide adequate and efficient air carrier service (p. 321)."

I think you might study that language with some care. Some people may feel that Congress put too much emphasis on the need of the public for air transportation at the lowest cost consistent with the furnishing of the service, too much emphasis on the reasonableness of the charges, and not enough emphasis on the need of the carriers for a healthy profit. But for my part, unless and until the Congress changes the law, I expect to try to follow it the way it's written.

I would like to move on now to some other questions which seem to be of considerable current interest—the length of the period to be taken into account in determining the reasonableness of earnings and the application of the rate of return standard to particular sets of circumstances. Here I will quote again from the Board's 1960 opinion:

"(a) No party has suggested that we attempt to regulate fares so as to produce a particular rate of return for every 12-month period. It is manifest that in an industry in which costs and revenue factors tend to fluctuate and are difficult to forecast precisely for any short-term period, any attempt to maintain a constant rate of return would be futile. There is thus general agreement among the parties that the fare levels must be regulated to produce a reasonable return over an extended period of time.

"This is not to say that short-term considerations need always be ignored. * * * the extent to which short-term factors would be influential in affecting the fare level must depend on the length of time those factors are expected to remain operative and the magnitude of their impact on the carriers' operating results.

"From the foregoing it is apparent that the problem of determining when and for what periods fare adjustments should be made cannot be relegated for solution to any mechanical device. * * * the determination of when to permit fare adjustments and the length of the future period which should be considered in making these adjustments can be resolved only on a case-by-case basis, applying informed judgment to the task of balancing the relevant factors (p. 328)."

I don't see how I could improve on that statement, so I'll move along to events subsequent to the 1960 opinions. For the next 4 years, the industry's profits were so low the 10.5 percent standard was academic. But in 1964 there was a sharp turn for the better, and in 1965 the rate of return on investment rose above 10.5 percent. It is worth noting that earnings did not just slowly creep up to the 10.5-percent level and barely edge over. When they reached this level, they were rising rapidly and the trend is still strongly upward.

The Board was called on to deal with this situation in July in disposing of certain fare increases that had been proposed in connection with an improvement in the free baggage allowance.

In suspending the proposed increases in fares, the Board in an order dated July 27, 1965, stated some views with respect to the relationships between carrier earnings and the regulation of fares. In this statement, the Board made a particular effort to state its views as precisely as it could. The language it used then is still the best guide I know as to the Board's current views. Accordingly, I would suggest that interested persons who have not read the order itself might wish to do so, and I shall impose on you now by reading a part of it which I regard as particularly significant:

"Fortunately, the earnings of the carriers are good enough to permit them to inaugurate improvements in service even when accompanied by the loss of some revenue. In the general passenger fare investigation (docket No. 8008), 32 CAB 291 (decided November 25, 1960), the Board found that a weighted average return for the domestic trunkline carriers of 10.5 percent on invested capital is fair and reasonable. This rate of return has been reached in the 12 months ended March 31, 1965, and reports of current earnings show that the trend continues strongly upward. While the Board recognizes that 'fare levels must be regulated to produce a reasonable return over an extended period of time,' 32 CAB 291, 328, it is nevertheless difficult to find justification for fare increases at a time when current earnings have reached a fair and reasonable level and are still climbing. The Board does conclude, therefore, that the fare increases herein proposed by the trunk carriers should be investigated and suspended.

"On the contrary, the Board believes that the present favorable earnings position of the carriers offers an excellent opportunity for the carriers themselves to consider reductions in fares, or improvements in service without fare increases, with a view to broadening and strengthening the economic base of the industry and improving service to the public. It would be very desirable for the carriers themselves to take the initiative in this kind of activity."

I call your attention to four points about the language of this order:

1. The Board referred with apparent approval to the 10.5-percent rate of return standard from the earlier 1960 opinion.

2. The Board again expressly recognized that fare levels must be regulated to produce a reasonable rate of return over an extended period of time.

3. The Board emphasized the desirability of tariff changes of a promotional nature that would build additional traffic.

4. The Board indicated a preference for reductions in fares and service improvements initiated by the carriers themselves.

Just to keep the record straight, I suppose I should say the Board might someday feel that the industry has matured and stabilized enough to warrant reexamination of the 10.5-percent standard. But I know of no current thought or plans to do so.

I will say to you quite candidly, if I can have my first choice, I would like to see two things happen concurrently: One, reductions in passenger fares, and, two, continued increases in air carrier profits. Before you say I'm crazy, you'd better look at the record.

Some weeks ago an airline executive whom I greatly respect and admire gave me a paper which pointed out that airlines have made many voluntary reductions in their charges, and that in the past 2 years: "long haul first-class fares have been cut 10 percent; military furlough fares have been cut 50 percent; family plan fares for a coach group of three have been cut 33⅓ percent; excess baggage charges have been cut 80 percent; freight yields have been cut 3 to 5 percent; mail rates have been cut 8 percent."

Now, let's see what happened to earnings and profits during these same 2 years:

In the year ending June 30, 1964, the net profits after taxes and special items for the domestic trunk carriers was 180 percent higher than the preceding year.

In the year ending June 30, 1965, it was 211 percent higher than in the year ending June 30, 1964, rising from $57.7 to $179.7 million.

Take another example—transatlantic fares:

Effective April 1, 1964, the largest and broadest fare reductions in the history of North Atlantic air transportation were put into effect. The annual reduction in fares has been estimated to approximate $50 million. The net result has been a gratifying growth in volume of passengers, a virtually unprecedented improvement in passenger load factor and for most American and foreign carriers a major improvement in operating profits.

I will readily concede that these examples do not establish the proposition that any and all fare reductions result in increased profits. On the other hand, I think you must concede they do establish the proposition that the two things can exist simultaneously.

This suggests the area where we should be working together to achieve the best possible results for both the traveling public and the airlines. Our relationships should be straight-forward, candid, and, I would hope, friendly. Each of us should recognize that the other has a somewhat different set of responsibilities—and should respect the position of the other in trying to meet those responsibilities.

We should get to work doing a great deal of arithmetic together to see where our differences in judgment really lie when we have the facts sorted out as best we possibly can. I think we might discover at that stage that our differences in judgment are suprisingly small.

For the present, I will leave this with the simple statement that in my judgment reductions in passenger fares are not necessarily synonymous with reduced profits.

I have been told that this particular group of airline executives includes those whose special responsibilities include worrying about where to get the money to make the payments on that $3 billion plus of flight equipment you have on order. I suggest that one possibility you might examine is ways and means to fill up some more of those empty seats in the planes you fly. I think it likely some of the things you have done already—such as the family-fare plan and the stand-by fare for servicemen—have had and are having just this kind of effect, for the benefit of everyone. Incidentally, I hope that with your help we can improve our techniques for evaluating the effect of changes in fares and particularly specific promotional fares.

In any event, I hope you will not have too much trouble finding the money to make the payments on those new aircraft, and I wish for you and your carriers much prosperity.

Old "Red Mike" Quill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all relieved that the New York transportation strike has finally been settled. However, the economic tragedy that struck the people of New York City will have repercussions for years.

The Suburban Eagle, an outstanding independent publication serving a number of communities in southern Cook County, Ill., carried a strong and pertinent editorial on this strike last week which merits review.

OLD "RED MIKE" QUILL

The international president of the transport workers union of New York City, Michael J. Quill is one of the last of the old-time labor leaders.

Quill's actions is a clear indication that "Old Red Mike" as Quill was called in the 1930's because of Communist association has no regard for the millions of poor people which depend upon New York's transportation system.

His act of publicly tearing up the courts injunctions against the strikes, based on the common law and New York's Condon Wadlin Act which forbid strikes by public employees; is one of utter contempt.

The statement Red Mike gave the New York newspaper in reference to Justice Abraham N. Geller's ruling on the antistrike injunction, "I will not call off the strike and the judge can drop dead in his black robes," is a very clear indication of the respect Red Mike has for the American way.

The "big stick" Mike Quill is swinging might well be the stick that will nail himself to the wall.

The question has arisen as to the reason for Mike's action, can the strike be the backlash of Lindsay being elected as mayor?

Is this the "in crowd" way of getting even with the citizens of New York for breaking the political machine?

Whatever the reasons we must keep in mind the bargaining rights that are rightfully due labor unions are not being denied the transportation union of New York.

The only rights that are being denied are those of the poor citizens who depend upon New York's vast network of transportation to provide them the service that they so desperately need to get to and from work.

Sylvia Porter on the War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the sometimes deafening and ofttimes politically inspired chorus of criticism of the war on poverty has, in many instances, obscured the genuine progress that has been made in fighting this great national problem. It seems to me that one of the major lessons we must learn from this first year of the war on poverty is that we must be patient. We must not expect the millenium overnight. In support I cite a column by the distinguished financial writer Sylvia Porter, as published in the Washington Star, December 12, 1965.

I would call your attention, particularly, to her comment that "we have started a tough war which will be often frustrating and which will take at least a generation to win."

Under leave to extend my remarks I include Miss Porter's column at this point in the RECORD:

YOUR MONEY'S WORTH: FIGURES TELL OF POVERTY WAR

(By Sylvia Porter)

In the 12 months since the first Federal antipoverty grant was made under the Economic Opportunity Act, more than $1.1 billion has been spent to fight poverty the Nation over.

Yet, welfare rolls and doles have climbed. Teenage unemployment remains at more than 13 percent. There are still 11 million poor adult illiterates. Some 750,000 high school students will have dropped out in 1965. At the same time there has been a mounting chorus of criticism about political sleight of hand with Federal antipoverty funds, lack of participation by the poor, Job Corps brawls.

Under the circumstances, a poverty progress report is distinctly in order. Exactly what has $1.1 billion bought to date? How many of the Nation's 34 million poor citizens have been helped, and how many unemployed actually have received training, acquired vocational skills, learned to read and write?

Here is a head count:

1. Nine hundred thousand needy individuals in 600 communities have been directly helped under local community action programs, through schooling, legal assistance, child care, health improvement measures.

2. Five hundred and sixty thousand preschool children have completed summer courses to help bring them up to the academic-physical-social levels of their fellow students in kindergarten and first grade this fall.

3. Four hundred thousand high school dropouts or would-be dropouts have worked or are now working at full- or part-time jobs under the Neighborhood Youth Corps to acquire work experience and funds to stay in school or return to school.

4. One hundred and seventy-five thousand college students have worked or are now working at full- or part-time jobs to help finance their education.

5. One hundred thousand hard-core unemployed adults—most of them on welfare—have been taught the elementary work habits essential for jobs.

6. Forty thousand illiterate adults have received instruction to bring them up to the eighth-grade level of schooling.

7. Sixteen thousand rural citizens have received loans for improving their farms or homes or for setting up small businesses.

8. Fifteen thousand disadvantaged high school dropouts are now enrolled in 74 Job Corps centers to acquire education and vocational training for jobs.

This adds up to about 2.2 million individuals who have been helped directly through the Federal antipoverty program in its first year. In addition, statisticians at the Office of Economic Opportunity estimate another 2 million have been helped indirectly—such as the unemployed mother who can take a paying job because her child is being cared for in a day care center, the rural family whose breadwinner receives a small business loan. Still more thousands have been helped by VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America.

By the end of this year, the total number of individuals reached directly or indirectly by the antipoverty war is expected to be about 6 million—about 1 in 6 of the estimated poor.

Of course, the statistics aren't the whole picture. There are also intangible "pluses" that cannot be measured: The North Carolina 16-month-old baby who was recently fed her first solid food, the Oregon teenager "retardate" who, after an intensive 8-week tutoring course, turned out to have exceptional ability in mathematics. There is the nationwide awakening to the problem in a period of great prosperity—illustrated by the unprecedented numbers of serious volunteers who have enlisted in the war.

Most intangible plus of all, and yet profoundly significant, is our realization that no amount of money can solve the poverty problem in even 5 or 10 years—much less 12 months. Our experience has emphasized that we have started a tough war which will be often frustrating and which will take at least a generation to win.

A Tired American Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial by Alan McIntosh, which appeared in the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn., recently.

The editorial, reprinted in the December 24 edition of the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., follows:

A TIRED AMERICAN SPEAKS OUT

The following editorial by Alan McIntosh, which recently appeared in the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn., reflects the feelings that many—and perhaps most—Americans have about current conditions and attitudes:

"I am a tired American. I am tired of being called the ugly American. I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

"I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

"I am a tired American—weary of being lectured by General de Gaulle (who never won a battle) who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

"I am a tired American—weary of Nasser and all the other blood-sucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

"I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

"I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the 'new wave' of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

"I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

"I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than Government relief checks for three generations.

"I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched Americans in an obscenity race—who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture—in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage.

"I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

"I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with the civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

"I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bedsheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

"I am a tired American who dislikes clergymen who have made a career out of integration causes, yet send their children to private schools.

"I am a tired American—who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private initiative are only synonyms for greed.

"They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

"I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the 'have nots' achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

"I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the 'Star-Spangled Banner' and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes of the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

"I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God, truly, with mercy and justice for all."

State of the Union Address

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's state of the Union address last night was a most sobering experience not only for all of us in Congress, but also for the Nation as a whole. It was a serious report to the American people, and to the world at large, on the problems confronting us at home and abroad in the trying days and months ahead.

The President minced no words. He described the situation in the world today as he sees it from his vantage point of leadership. As a capable leader of his Nation and one of the outstanding leaders of the world, he prescribed a program of constructive recommendations which should go far in coping with many of the problems facing us. I feel certain the Congress and the American people will uphold the President in most or all of his recommendations.

I believe that most of the President's proposals are in the best interests of America because their aim is to provide greater strength and security for our country, continued economic prosperity for our people, and peace for a troubled world which is hungry for peace.

On the whole, it was a momentous address, earnest in tone, impressive in its presentation. I found the President's confidence in the strength of America most reassuring in these crucial days in world history.

Al Kealoha Perry: His Music Means Hawaii to Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has in the last century gone through a metamorphosis from a romantic string of islands in the Pacific to one of America's most powerful bastions of defense. The islands have been able to retain their glamor and charm largely because of individuals who have devoted their lifetime to the perpetuation of old Hawaiian customs and music.

One of the most successful perpetuators of island music is Al Kealoha Perry, who for 30 years has been heard on the Hawaii Calls radio program. Mr. Perry, or "Al," as he prefers to be called, says that his "one aim as a musical leader has been to get the people of the world to enjoy our island songs and chants." He has, of course, been eminently successful in achieving his aim. Hawaiian music, wherever it is heard, evokes a nostalgic and romantic response.

Born of a Hawaiian mother, Emily Kanekoleakawahinekapuomua Kekuewa, and an English father, M. Hazard Perry, who came from Springfield, Ill. Al has had little difficulty in impressing his audiences with his sincerity. A glimpse into Al's boyhood, as revealed to Mr. Charles Ware, of the Honolulu Advertiser, convinces us that his island flavor is genuine and sincere. Al relates how, as a boy of 12, he used to sing "Pua Carnation" accompanied on the piano by Queen Liliuokalani, the last Hawaiian monarch.

A grateful Hawaii has showered many honors on him, not the least of which were two resolutions of congratulations by the Hawaii State Legislature. After recovering from a recent illness, Al is now looking forward to the production of Hawaii Calls as a television show. In true Al Perry tradition, he says:

> The thing I want is to see that it keeps the same flavor it always has had. That's what is important to me.

And I concur with Mr. Ware's statement:

> That's what is important to Hawaii, too.

Mr. Ware's interesting article on Hawaii's own Al Keoloha Perry, which appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 2, 1966, follows:

[From the Star-Bulletin & Advertiser, Jan. 2, 1966]

AL KEALOHA PERRY: HIS MUSIC MEANS HAWAII TO MILLIONS

(By Charles A. Ware)

Al Kealoha Perry, whose rich baritone has been the image of Hawaii to millions of listeners over the last 30 years, didn't start out to be a musician at all.

He was an engineer first. And actually it was engineering that set him on the trail that led finally to his long-time post as musical director of the Hawaii Calls broadcast.

But first of all he is an islander of half-Hawaiian, half-English ancestry completely devoted to the special spirit and the special feeling of island music.

"My one aim as a musical leader has been to get the people of the world to enjoy our island songs and chants," Perry said. "To accomplish this, you have to win the admiration of the people of the islands, as well as that of the Hawaiian entertainer, no matter where he might be.

"To do this, your soul must be in it. Your audience senses the sincerity."

That sincerity could be heard as clearly as the beat of the pahu drum in the nearly 1,500 Hawaii Calls broadcasts for which Perry directed the music from 1936 until he was stricken by a heart attack in September 1964.

Now well recovered, Perry paid his first visit to the broadcast as a guest 2 weeks ago. No one had forgotten. The audience that filled the Banyan Court of the Moana Hotel gave him a rousing ovation.

Last week, Perry sat relaxed on the lanai of his second-floor apartment overlooking the placid carp pond of the famous Willows restaurant, managed by his wife, Kathleen.

Clad in dark slacks and an open-neck sport shirt, he talked quietly of the incidents in his long career. Later, he slipped into a conservative jacket before walking downstairs to the restaurant for a cocktail and lunch.

DAYS AT AWINI

Perry was born February 2, 1901, in Kohala, on the big island, and his boyhood was at Awini, high in the Kohala Mountains.

His father was M. Hazard Perry, who came from Springfield, Ill., where he had known Lincoln by sight. He had served as a lieutenant in the Union Army during the Civil War and then migrated to the islands.

Perry does not know what brought his father here. "So far as I know, he just got on a boat and came," he said. But during Perry's boyhood, he was manager of the Kohala Ditch Co., which supplies water to the sugar plantation along the coast of the North Kohala district.

Perry's mother was the former Emily Kanekoleakawahinekapuomua Kekuewa. She was from the village of Haena on the Kohala coast, between Upolu and Mahukona.

You can reach it today by jeep, over a rough road across private ranch lands, Perry said. The stone walls of old canoe shelters still stand, and he has located the foundation stones of the grass house where his mother lived as a girl.

The Hawaii that Perry knew in his boyhood is a far cry from Waikiki. It is a land of dark, forbidding cliffs and lush green forests, of frequent rains and, he recalls, of occasional hailstorms.

It's a mysterious land, cut by deep gorges where the sun penetrates only at midday, and where the clouds and fog swirl in from the sea in the early afternoon.

To glimpse it, you must journey to the northern point of the big island and drive past Hawi and the Kohala Courthouse to the end of the road, where an observation area looks out over Pololu Valley.

Across the valley, the black lava cliff rises sheer, and a faint zigzag line can be traced across its face. That is the trail to Awini.

And this is the trail that Perry remembers walking many times as a boy to get the mail at Pololu Landing or with the men who were to carry back supplies. "Look," he said, pointing to bulging calves. "That trail gave me tremendous legs. They were like this even when I was a kid. And when I got into the Army, I thought the training hikes were nothing."

In the cold, damp climate of the Perry's mountain home, the kitchen was the center of family life. As youngsters, Al and his brothers and sisters played there often, or sat and watched the cooking.

And they heard their mother singing the old songs.

"I didn't know I was learning," Perry said. "But years later, when I needed them, the songs were there."

Al first went to school in Kohala in a privately supported one-room school. Then, when he was about 12, he was sent to Honolulu to enter Iolani School.

It then was located on Beretania Street, next to St. Andrew's Cathedral, and its grounds adjoined those of Washington Place, which still was the home of Queen Liliuokalani.

He was a boarding student, and there were times after class when he slipped over the fence to gather coconuts. He was fascinated, too, to hear the former ruler playing the piano and ultimately she noticed her young admirer.

"One of the songs I knew as a kid was 'Pua Carnation,'" Perry said. "It was one of her favorites, and I used to sing it for her."

While he was a student at Iolani, he went to Sunday school at St. Andrew's, and he sang in the choir for services of the Hawaiian Congregation. Later he was a member of the choir at Kawaiahao Church.

When he was 16, Perry took his first job, as machinist's apprentice for Catton, Neill & Co., which later was to be absorbed in Honolulu Iron Works.

Rowing was a popular sport of the day, and he joined the old Myrtle Boat Club, one of those which competed regularly in the Regatta Day races in Honolulu Harbor. He also tried to join the Canadian Army to fight in World War I, but was rejected because of his youth.

Finally, when he was 17 and America was at war, he was accepted by the U.S. Army, and served with it in France. He was wounded at Chateau Thierry, and besides the Purple Heart he holds a Battle Service Medal with five bars.

But it was the influenza epidemic of 1918 that felled him at the end of the war, giving him the greatest fright of his musical career. He was in the hospital on the first Armistice Day, and for a month he lost his voice completely.

It was May of 1919 by the time he got back to Honolulu and returned to work at Catton, Neill & Co.

And it was about the same time he met Kathleen McGuire. Both remember the occasion well. It was a dance of the Myrtle Boat Club, and Al—still in uniform—was taking tickets at the door.

They were introduced, and later he asked her to dance. "He stepped all over my feet," Kathleen said, and Al replied, "Yes, but you liked it."

They were married in 1920, and have one son, Grandison (Grandy). He now assists his mother in management of the Willows.

On the job, after he returned from the war, Perry worked as a draftsman. At the same time, he began studying by correspondence, taking courses in engineering and business administration from LaSalle Extension University, Alexander Hamilton Institute, and International Correspondence Schools.

He worked for a time as draftsman for Architect Guy Rothwell and then, in 1925, joined the city and county building department as a project director.

From 1933 to 1935, he worked at Pearl Harbor as a construction inspector, then returning to the city until after the time of the Pearl Harbor attack.

He was one of a group of musicians who played and sang at campaign rallies for Mayor Fred Wright. After the mayor established the Honolulu Hale Glee Club, Perry became its director in 1935.

He had been a member of the Aloha Temple's Shrine Chanters since 1929, while the group was under the leadership of Charles E. King.

It was from the city hall group that Perry selected the six members of his original Singing Surfriders. In 1936, that group replaced the Harry Owens orchestra as the regular musicians on the "Hawaii Calls" broadcasts which had been originated about a year earlier by Webley Edwards.

In those days, the show went to the mainland directly by radio, and when 2 o'clock came, it was on the air. As the hour approached, the tension was far greater than in the later era of magnetic tape and delayed broadcasts, Perry recalled.

There were occasional moments of crisis, but always "Hawaii Calls" went to the networks on schedule, week after week and year after year.

There were changes, gradually, in the personnel of the Singing Surfriders and the Waikiki Maids who joined them. Perry and Edwards became the musical godfathers of whole generations of the islands' best-known entertainers.

But always, Perry insisted upon finished musical performance and adherence to the spirit of the old Hawaiian songs, even though there might be new songs and new arrangements.

After the United States was plunged into World War II, "there wasn't much left to do in the engineer's office at city hall," Perry said, and he soon went back to Pearl Harbor as an engineer in the 14th Naval District public works office.

He was assigned as engineer for projects on the big island. It was as result as one of those jobs that he received a citation in 1944 from the Secretary of the Navy for work "above and beyond the call of duty."

That was for the speedy construction of a rest camp in the Kamuela area for combat personnel returning from the western Pacific.

"One of the first things I had to have was a water supply," Perry said, "and to find it I walked along the whole length of the old Honokoa ditch.

"I found it was leaking all along the way. I don't think that more than 50 percent of the water was getting to the plantation lands. So I went to the manager of Honokoa Plantation, which controls the ditch, and I told him that if he would give us the water the Navy would repair all the leaks.

"We would have the water we needed for the camp, and when the war was over he would have the full supply from the ditch. But he turned me down.

INSTANT WATER

"I had to have water and I didn't have much time. So we went back up and we tapped the leaks. We got bulldozers and other heavy equipment up into those hills and we used gunnite to concrete over the heads of two ravines," Perry said.

"We worked around the clock, with big floodlights at night. In a couple of weeks we had two reservoirs, one holding about 11 million gallons of water and the other about 9 million."

The Navy citation is only one in a series of honors that have come to Perry over the years.

In 1950, the chamber of commerce chose him as one of its men of the week, and in 1957 the chamber's retail board named him father of the year in the field of entertainment. The Navy Public Works Office in 1961 selected him as its candidate for the civil servant of the year.

Twice, in 1960 and last year, the Hawaii Legislature has adopted formal resolutions congratulating him for his long and valued association with "Hawaii Calls." The most recent Senate resolution, adopted during his illness, declared that the association should continue.

And it has.

He is listed on the program as musical director, though since his illness last year his assistant, Benny Kalama, has carried on the duties. "He's done a grand job," Perry said.

The day before Perry went back to visit the broadcast, the "Hawaii Calls" entertainers held a luncheon for him.

They presented him with a monkeypod cribbage board inscribed "To Our Boss." He's missed, they told him, and "they asked me to go on working for them."

Slimmed down by 70 pounds from the weight that used to inspire on-the-air quips about "you'll see two people when he turns around," Perry is feeling "just real good" these days.

He is happly with plans for the production of "Hawaii Calls" as a television show. "It is something that we all worked toward for a long, long time. The thing I want is to see that it keeps the same flavor it always has had," Perry said. "That's what is important to me."

That's what is important to Hawaii, too.

That, and that other island musical institution, Al Kealoha Perry.

Man of the South for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, former Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., has been named the "Man of the South" for 1965 by Dixie Business magazine.

I believe the following news release concerning the distinguished Senator will be of interest to my colleagues as well as to my constituents in Georgia's Fourth District, home of Dixie Business magazine and editor, Hubert F. Lee.

MAN OF THE SOUTH

Former Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., who retired November 11, 1965, from the U.S. Senate after 50 years of distinguished public service, was today named the "Man of the South" for 1965 by Dixie Business magazine. He is the 20th to be honored since 1946.

Hubert F. Lee, for 36 years editor of Dixie Business, said that Senator Byrd was named from an honor group limited to 200 living leaders termed the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living." The group includes Winthrop Rockefeller, of Little Rock, Ark.; Daniel J. Haughton, Alabama-born president of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif; Virginia-born Owen R. Cheatham, Georgia-Pacific Corp., New York; and former Congressman Carl Vinson.

Senator Byrd is an eighth generation of the Byrds of Virginia and on June 14, 1964, was awarded the Magna Carta Day Award by the Baronial Order of Magna Carta, a patriotic organization of descendants of the sure-ties chosen at the time of the promulgation of the famous Magna Carta by the English barons at Runnymede on June 14, 1215.

A 33d-degree Mason, Byrd in 1963 was presented the Grand Master's Award by the Grand Master of Masons of the District of Columbia. Editor Lee is a 32d-degree Mason and a Shriner.

On May 15, 1965, the third annual "New Market Medal" was presented to Senator Byrd on the 101st anniversary of New Market Day by Virginia Military Institute.

At the age of 15, Senator Byrd talked his father into letting him run the Winchester Star (Winchester, Va.) which he built into a valuable newspaper property. His son, HARRY F. BYRD, JR., who succeeded him as U.S. Senator, is editor of the Winchester Star and president of the Harrisonburg News-Record.

Senator Byrd, Sr., is the world's largest applegrower and an outstanding business leader.

Senator Byrd was named to the vacancy on the honor group caused by his death of his late brother, Adm. Richard Byrd, who was honored in 1953.

The late Bernard M. Baruch, who was the "Man of the South" for 1964, on June 11, 1958, nominated Senator Byrd, when the Senator planned to retire from the U.S. Senate.

In the 1965 advisory poll conducted by Lee for 20 years, the chairman of United Press International, Frank H. Bartholomew, wrote: "I think Harry F. Byrd, Sr. qualified in every way to be named 'Man of the South.'" Lee was manager and staff correspondent of the United Press Atlanta bureau in 1924 and 1925, before leaving to become advertising manager of the Anderson (S.C.) Independent in 1925.

Cranston Williams, retired executive vice president of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, now living in Lynchburg, Va., wrote: "I am delighted that Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. has been suggested. My ballot shows that he is my first and only choice for this year. He is conspicuous, outstanding example of a man serving his country in the face of pressures which other people do not seem to be able to withstand."

Sam Latimer, Jr., columnist and retired editor of the State, Columbia, S.C., morning newspaper, write: "I think Senator Byrd is fine. Don't get discouraged about your work. It is a nice thing that you do and appreciated. Sometimes when we do these civic chores, we wonder. So I know how you feel. But keep up your work * * *."

Remmie Arnold, past imperial potentate of the Shrine and for 50 years a leading pen manufacturer at Petersburg, Va., wrote, "I am delighted to find Senator Byrd eligible. Yes, I approve. I think it is wonderful for you to do this."

Former Governor and Congressman Colgate Darden, Jr., another of the honor group of 200: "I approve."

Lee said that former U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr. would be recorded by history as a great man even if he had confined his great vitality and business leadership to any one of the fields he has excelled in—statesmanship—publishing—world's greatest applegrower.

Louis B. Seltzer Writes "30"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, recently announced his retirement. In his 50 years of service with this Scripps-Howard Newspaper, including 37½ years as editor, Mr. Seltzer has developed a proud national reputation not only as a journalist but in the fields of positive civic action and service to his fellow man.

His role has been varied; reformer, watchdog, press agent, friend of all the people. In his own words, he has "walked with the people in their hours both of problems and happiness." He has shared their dreams, their frustrations, their triumphs, and their not-infrequent disappointments. Under Louis Seltzer's leadership, the Press quickly won an international reputation for courageous crusading and fearless reporting. It also added a new dimension—public service. Mr. Seltzer has headed numerous local organizations—the Welfare Federation, Cleveland Convention and Visitors Bureau, Greater Cleveland Safety Council, among others—and on the national scene he is a member of the Pulitzer Prize Advisory Board and a founder of the American Press Institute.

One of his most prized possessions is the Brotherhood Award given him in 1951 by the National Conference of Christians and Jews in appreciation of his long labor in that vineyard.

My reaction to the announcement of his retirement was that the Press without Louis Seltzer would be difficult to imagine and it will be. The paper will miss him and so will his thousands of readers. But if anyone ever earned a change, it is Louis Seltzer.

Of course, his retirement as editor does not mean he has nothing more to say. He will continue to write articles from time to time as well as a book which he has had in mind for some time. Few have so much to say in so many fields as Louis Seltzer; few have the gift of expression that he has. On the occasion of his retirement I express the hope that he be blessed with good health and the keen enthusiasm one associates with him. I find myself among those who will watch eagerly for his next venture.

As part of my remarks, I include the following articles from the Cleveland Press, "L.B.S. Writes '30,'" and "L.B.S. Welcomes His Successor":

L.B.S. Writes "30"

Another name replaces mine at the top of this page with Monday's issue.

It will read, "Thomas Boardman, Editor."

It will be the first change of name in that spot in nearly 38 years.

The man who relinquishes the title of editor assumed it when he was 30. He is now approaching 69. For a half century he has worked exclusively for this newspaper, lived for it, fought for it, dreamed for it.

He had help. He had the best group of men and women throughout that period any editor in America could conceivably wish or have. They made the Cleveland Press. They helped make it one of what Time magazine not long ago listed as among the 10 best newspapers in America.

With Tom Boardman, one of the ablest journalists in America, on the bridge of this journalistic ship, it will sail on to greater glory and achievement. Of that I am sure. He will make Greater Cleveland proud of him. He will make the Press proud of him. He will make the men and women of the Press proud of him.

As I take my leave of the newspaper which has been my sole professional life for 50 years I set aside one title and assume another.

I will be proud to wear for the rest of my life the simple title of "Citizen of Greater Cleveland."

For that is what I intend to be, to live here, to be at the side of Marion's and my family, to work for it, dream for it, and everlastingly fight for it. This is a great city. It will be greater than ever in the future. It is on the way. It needs all the help and inspiration all of us can give it—our sweat and sinew, our dreams and hard work, our faith and our greatest hopes.

Marion in her gentle way used to say she didn't know which came first in my life, the paper, the city or herself. She said that but she knew which came first. No one ever doubted that. But the other two, the city and the paper, were so inextricably intermingled I never knew for sure which was which.

And now that someone else will guide the paper's destiny I will devote my effort and my love for it to my home community—the community in which I was born as a child in a struggling family, and which endowed me with those qualities, such as they were, that enabled me to stand up in the race of life these many years.

Some men and women at the Press at whose side I worked through the years are still here. Many more have gone. Some are editors of other newspapers and magazines. Others are in different professions and business. The Press alumni are scattered all over America. I am proud of them.

I am most proud of those who are still here. They have been the stalwarts. They have given of themselves as much or more to this paper than have I. They have always been at my side.

From the Scripps-Howard newspapers, of which the Cleveland Press was the first, and which today is preeminently the foremost newspaper group in America, I have had throughout the almost 38 years as editor the utmost support, cooperation, understanding, and latitude in adapting it to the especially sensitive requirements of this vast and wonderful community. At no time have I ever been inhibited or circumscribed in the use of whatever judgment or enterprise was needed for doing that which was either essential, desirable or called for.

For the past 15 years I have had the blessing of one of America's ablest newspaper business managers in George E. Carter, whose candid, searching, cooperative qualities have strengthened and buoyed me immeasurably. He has stood solidly at my side.

One other was at my side. She is no longer here, and yet she is—ever present, stimulating, inspiring and beckoning me on, and on, and on, always as she did. I look up to her today as I always did—and always will.

For her I thank God. For the opportunity to be editor of this newspaper through so many of its exciting and significant years I am thankful. For the privilege now of serving my city as a citizen in any way shape or form I may, I will also be grateful.

I write the traditional "30" to a career in journalism. I will now write the book I have been requested to write—and bend my back and put my muscles and sinew to the community's plow to help furrow its future.

—LOUIS B. SELTZER.

L.B.S. Welcomes His Sucessor

Tom Boardman is coming back home—to his very first newspaper home and love. This, the Cleveland Press, is where he started his journalistic career right off the campus of nearby Oberlin.

It was here in 1939 that Tom, by steady, persistent and exceptional ability, started the series of upward moves from one position of responsibility to another, eventually becoming this paper's chief editorial writer—and, as such, its principal policy maker.

Except for a few years away in World War II, in which he distinguished himself as one of the Navy's youngest and most courageous officers, he was continuously at The Press until 3 years ago when he was appointed editor of the Indianapolis Times.

To Tom Boardman, the man who takes the place I have held for nearly 38 years, I can and do pay the highest compliment:

I say that Tom is the logical and natural choice to edit this newspaper. His assumption of this great responsibility brings a sense of comfort to me both for the paper, for its staff and for my home community in the future.

Consolidated Edison Indian Point Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we, the citizens of New York, must welcome the announcement that the Consolidated Edison Co. plans to quadruple the capacity of its Indian Point nuclear generating plant in Westchester County. Indian Point is the company's second largest producer of electricity, surpassed only by its plant in Ravenswood in Queens County. The latter station is conventional, using coal and/or fuel oil. New York City, which must always be supplied with power—inordinate power—will have adequate electrical power with the enlarged nuclear capacity at Indian Point.

Thus, Consolidated Edison acknowledges public responsibility.

Nuclear generation of power has become competitive with other fuels in cost. But the real advantage of nuclear power is the absence of damaging substances pumped into the air, causing polllution. With nuclear power there is no smoke nuisance. Coal burning on the other hand, produces air pollution. No matter how much you try to prevent such pollution with expensive apparatus, there is no appreciable abatement of the soot in the atmosphere.

More and more energy is being used for commercial, industrial, and residential purposes. Almost everything moves by electricity—even toothbrushes. The Consolidated Edison's facilities are taxed to the utmost to supply the demand of electricity and it is hard put to develop new sources of power.

Despite the opposition aroused, most of it unrealistic and unnecessary, to building a nuclear plant in Ravenswood, Queens, I supported that effort in the interest of progress and an answer to the city's needs. There was no inherent danger as charged. Public anxiety, however, triumphed despite the safety assurances and that project was abandoned.

At the time of the hearing on the Queens Ravenswood proposed nuclear plant, there was an emotional appeal that the safety of the city would be endangered by a possible nuclear explosion. Appropriate scientific evidence was developed to prove the contrary. There are numerous cities harboring nuclear projects, with no apparent danger. The public must sooner or later realize that nuclear power must have widespread use. The removal of the poison from the air more than compensates for whatever increased cost there may be in the generation of nuclear power.

Eventually, I presume, the generation of nuclear power will become cheaper than any other source of power. When the Indian Point project is fully expanded, that station alone will provide electricity to satisfy the needs of 2½ million people. In addition, I understand that this company will add a 500,000,-kilowatt generating unit to its Arthur Kill Station in Travis, Staten Island, at a cost of $65 million.

This will be a conventional unit. It will be set up to meet the additional needs of the population of New York City.

In a subsequent statement, I will have something to say about the company's hydroelectric plant at Cornwall, N.Y.

These additional facilities are clear indications that this company does not wish to risk another blackout in New York City. There are certain purblind people who always wish to stand in the way of progress. They are so addicted to the old ways that they fear the new. They would "rather bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." But the scientists know the effects of nuclear energy and they see no danger if there are proper safeguards. The future reservoir of almost all power will be nuclear and the present skeptics will have to realize this sooner or later. These are the same skeptics who, in the 15th century, warned Columbus not to set out on his voyage to India which finally led him to America. These are the same skeptics who, in 1888, said the Brooklyn Bridge would fall down. These are the same skeptics that denigrated Kittyhawk and flying machines and these are the same skeptics who scoff at our efforts to seek to reach the moon.

The Late Herbert C. Bonner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our late beloved chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, whose death is a grevious loss to all of us.

I have had the honor and the privilege of working with him as a member of the committee which he so ably headed. I found him to be a man of deep understanding, a devoted public servant, and a capable leader. His guidance and counsel were always most helpful. He was particularly helpful to me in matters pertaining to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy and other Coast Guard installations located in my district in Connecticut.

During the quarter of a century of his service in the House of Representatives, HERBERT BONNER not only left his imprint on Congress and on many legislative acts, but he also left a host of friends and admirers who had the highest regard for him. We shall always remember him as a man of wisdom, patience, courtesy, and able leadership. His death is a deep loss to those of us who had the occasion to work with him more closely.

I extend to his widow and to other members of his family my deepest sympathy in this hour of their great bereavement.

Draft Card Burners Should Be Laughed At

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. MACKIE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the 1st session of Congress adjourned, the Lapeer County Press, of Lapeer, Mich., had an excellent editorial on draft card burners.

I think the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues and I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DRAFT CARD BURNERS SHOULD BE LAUGHED AT

We don't like them deducting money for social security from our paycheck. So we burned our social security card. That's a joke. These young nuts who are burning their draft cards are also a joke. So laugh.

Not funny, you say? That's the trouble. Too many people are taking a few jerks too seriously. The card burners and sign carriers are getting too much publicity. What they should get is horse laughs until they blush beneath their beards. Will Rogers should be alive to squelch these clowns with a few choice jibes.

After all, is there anything funnier than a kid protesting war by burning his draft card? After he is drafted—and he will be—he can get even with a tough sergeant by dressing a doll in khaki and sticking pins into it. If he doesn't like the chow, he can burn his meal ticket. And if he has a lousy time on a 3-day pass, he can burn the pass.

In other words—so what? Who cares if a few nuts burn cards? They have a perfect right to register their protests. The thing to remember is they represent the tiniest percentage of our youth. They are getting attention far out of proportion to their importance. Certainly selective service would be wrong to advance the induction dates of these malcontents. There are enough inequities in the draft system without using it as a form of punishment. Besides, all most of these young clowns need is a little time to grow up, so give them all they have coming.

If you persist in worrying about what's happening to our youth, maybe some words from Bill Beckman will make you feel better. A student at MSU, Bill is the son of William Beckman, 112 South Lapeer Road. Lamenting the publicity given "the scum of our fair campus," Bill wrote the Press:

"I am sending along a clipping from the State News (our campus newspaper), which tells of how 15,872 students and faculty members at Michigan State University signed a petition supporting the President's policy in Vietnam.

"I'm proud to say my signature was among the 15,872. I'm certainly not a warmonger, and I'm well aware of all the pain and suffering going on in Vietnam. But we've committed our soldiers and our country to this policy, and right or wrong, moral or immoral, I feel that above everything else I'm an American.

"Of course this is only the opinion of one, but I'll bet I can find 15,871 individuals who will back me up. So the next time you read about some campus clowns protesting Vietnam, remember this letter and the 15,872 signatures of campus students and faculty members who supported instead of protested."

So don't fret. Laugh at them. That's what clowns are for.

Jim McDonough of Hawaii Completes Outstanding Service to Teacher Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, a lifetime of eventful and outstanding service in the field of education in Hawaii has been the contribution of James R. McDonough who, on January 15, 1966, will retire as executive secretary of the 7,000-member Hawaii Education Association.

"Mac," as he is affectionately known to at least two generations of school teachers, some of whom are his former students, began his career as a school teacher in Honolulu some 40 years ago. He drew a monthly paycheck of $90 in those days. The fact that a teacher in the same school today draws a monthly salary of about $700 is an example of the many tasks which Mac brought to noteworthy fruition during the 24 years that he served with the Hawaii Education Association after leaving the classroom.

Combining unusual talents as a top educator, an able administrator, and a most persuasive lobbyist, Mac has not only been able to win handsome salary increases for Hawaii's school teachers, but he has also won for them unusual and unlikely privileges such as full political freedom outside the classroom.

Mr. Speaker, as the people of Hawaii join the teachers whom Jim McDonough served so long and so well in bidding him aloha and Godspeed as he enters upon a period of well-earned rest, I commend for the reading of my colleagues in the Congress the following story on Mac which appeared in the January 6, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Advertiser:

McDonough Looks Back on Hard-Won Victories

(By Charles Turner)

When James R. McDonough was a teacher at Washington Intermediate School 40 years ago, his monthly salary was $90.

A teacher at that same school now gets about $700 a month.

Credit for this almost eightfold increase in salary goes in large part to McDonough, 60, who is retiring January 15 after serving exactly 24 years as executive secretary with the 7,000-member Hawaii Education Association.

There is a possibility the "hard-nosed Irishman" may remain on the job on a month-to-month basis after January 15, because the HEA board of directors is having a hard time filling his shoes.

The board has received some 45 applications, including about half a dozen from the mainland, for the job. The salary is $15,500 a year. However, it is believed the board will have to negotiate with McDonough's successor for a salary in the $15,000–$20,000 range.

The big problem in filling the post is that the new executive secretary must be:

A top educator.

A top administrator.

An experienced lobbyist.

McDonough was all of these things for the HEA during its formative years and won repeated renewals of his 4-year contracts for his success in achieving the teacher organization's goals.

These goals were finally reached last year, when the legislature granted a 22-percent increase in teacher salaries and added two additional classes, recognizing educational preparation beyond the 5th year (master's degree).

"We now rate among the top 10 in educational systems of comparable size," McDonough said.

McDonough, who has been connected with local and State educational institutions throughout his career, was president of the old Territorial Education Association before becoming its executive secretary in 1942.

There were only two employees then—McDonough and a secretary. The organization had only $4,000 in assets. Today, it has nine employees and at least $500,000 in assets.

It owns the building it occupies on Kalakaua Avenue, as well as an adjoining building and the land the two structures occupy.

Its membership now consists of 5,000 teachers in service and some 2,000 student teachers and retired teachers.

McDonough recalls that teachers had little or no political freedom when he came to Hawaii. The HEA spearheaded a drive to lift these restrictions and won its first victory in 1951. The old Department of Public Instruction amended the school code in that year to permit teachers to serve as delegates to political conventions.

However, it was not until 1956 that the DPI commissioners granted full political freedom outside of the classroom.

McDonough said legislatures in the past 10 years have been "far more enlightened toward education than the early ones.

"The caliber of the legislators is far superior to most States—and I've seen a lot of them," he said. "Ours are more inclined to be sympathetic to the needs of education. They are top professional people."

What about the caliber of today's teachers?

"Hawaii now has by far the highest qualified teachers of any State in the Union," McDonough said. "More than 80 percent have 5 or more years of college training."

He said Hawaii's certification standards are higher than those of mainland jurisdictions and there is a low turnover of teachers—only about 4 percent a year compared with the mainland average of 8 to 10 percent.

McDonough was asked for his views on professional bargaining, or teacher negotiations, and said:

"Professional bargaining is coming, that is certain. There are now seven States where boards of education are required by statute to negotiate with teacher organizations representing the majority of the teachers."

"The HEA will continue to press for such recognition," he said.

McDonough was asked whether this might raise the threat of teacher strikes.

"Not at all," he said. "Rather, the advent of professional bargaining would eliminate the probability of teacher strikes.

"This association, as well as the National Education Association, has and always will be opposed to teacher strikes."

Population Can Bury Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a major problem of increasing concern to the American people is population growth, not only in our country but throughout the world. This is a problem that must be faced forthrightly. It will require vigorous leadership if mass hunger, misery, and social unrest are to be avoided or at least not dramatically accelerated. The following editorial which appeared in the December 13, 1965, issue of the Chicago Daily News once again calls attention to the need for a prompt and positive effort to meet this problem.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 742, one of several resolutions now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture, to establish a U.S. World Food Study and Coordinating Commission to undertake a comprehensive study of all aspects of the present and projected world food and population situation in an effort to determine the U.S. potential for contributing to the solution of world food and population problems. I urge that prompt consideration be given to this proposal.

The Chicago Daily News editorial follows:

Population Can Bury Us

The famine threatening to engulf India, poignant as it is in terms of individual suffering, is only the immediately visible part of the massive iceberg of human want. George Weller, writing from Rome in the Daily News series on world famine, cites a recent study showing the 3 million children die each year from protein-calorie malnutrition. Untold millions who survive are stunted and maimed.

In an earlier article in the series, James McCartney, of our Washington bureau, reported that the presumably bottomless reservoir of U.S. food surpluses, which have sustained hundreds of millions of the world's people in recent years, are dwindling toward minimum emergency needs. It was pleasant to think of an America so prodigiously productive that it could, if necessary, sustain a good part of the world. But the world has been changing, swiftly and ominously.

Each day the world gains 192,000 people, and has that many more mouths to feed. Most of these are born into lands already barely able, or unable, to support the people already there. That is one reason, for example, that Charles H. Percy could bring back such a discouraging report from South America: Chile gross national product increased 1.5 percent last year; its population increased 2.5 percent; thus, its standard of living suffered a measurable drop.

But Chile's plight is mild compared even with that of the less fortunate Latin American countries, let alone India, China, and the struggling little have-not nations of Africa. There the produce of primitive and inefficient farming methods falls further and further behind the need, and the world becomes steadily less able to make up the lack. The fact that in some areas more and more people enjoy steadily higher living standards fails by a long shot to offset the fact that tens of millions are becoming steadily hungrier in the underdeveloped areas. And the efforts—in some cases monumental—to rev up the economic machinery of the underdeveloped lands are being largely nullified by the increasing hordes of new mouths to feed.

Mass starvation is never a mere local program. The agonies of hungry masses translate into desperate outthrusts for succor. An India unable to feed its people is a prime candidate for a Communist takeover. A China pressed by starving millions becomes a China reaching ruthlessly beyond its borders for the wherewithal to care for its own. There can be no such thing as a little island of plenty surviving indefinitely in a sea of want.

And the emergency is now. "There may still be a chance to avert a Malthusian disaster," writes J. George Harrar, president of the Rockefeller Foundation. "The auguries are not all unfavorable when viewed in terms of contemporary potentials for achievements. If the world's leaders in government, religion, education, and science become convinced of the need for action, agree upon appropriate methods, and take responsibility for the wide dissemination of information, as well as for the organization of of positive effort, then there is still hope."

Warning, however, that "whatever is done must be begun soon," he adds: "At best, the apparently unequal race between human procreation and food production can be won only after an immense and prolonged struggle, during which man will be evermore precariously crowding the margin of safety.

Harrar says that science can not only determine and control an acceptable rate of population; it can enable man to "double or treble current annual world food supplies."

There are important beginnings in both directions. American agricultural methods have been introduced with impressive results in many of the world's nations, including the Soviet Union and India.

India has, moreover, launched a widespread, intensive, and continuing program of disseminating birth control information as a governmental project. And last week the Roman Catholic Church, while failing to produce a fresh doctrine, acknowledged once more that population control is a valid and pressing subject for concern and continued its study looking toward a revised doctrine.

These are small steps, but world opinion is massive and budges with glacial slowness. The hope is that mankind can presently lift its gaze high enough above its political and ideological skirmishes to see the tidal wave that threatens to make all lesser concerns academic.

The 1,000th Anniversary of Christianity in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 1,000th anniversary of Christianity in Poland. In recognition of this fact, the Roman Catholic Diocese of Buffalo, N.Y., invited Vice President Humphrey to speak at a civic banquet held on January 8, 1966, to begin this year of celebration. My wife, Gail, and I were privileged to accompany Vice President and Mrs. Humphrey to Buffalo to join with Polish-Americans and non-Polish Americans alike in celebration of this memorable event.

Cold weather greeted us as we stepped out of the vice-presidential plane. But the enthusiasm and warmth of the several hundred people who waited in the cold for the Humphrey's arrival, more than made up for it.

The Vice President was first saluted with an old Polish custom of friendship—an offering of homemade bread and salt. This gesture set the theme for his entire visit, since it was soon obvious that he had conquered the heart of all Buffalo. A holiday atmosphere prevailed as the Vice President wound his way through the streets of East Buffalo on his way to the Statler Hilton Hotel.

Nuns, priests, children, and people of every description stood for hours in the 11° weather in anticipation of the Humphrey motorcade and burst into excitement as his car drove by.

As we entered the hotel, we were greeted by a band of small boys dressed in royal blue tuxedos, playing a gay polka. The St. Stanislaus Boys' Choir enthusiastically sang "This is my Country" and a bouncy original tune called "Hi Humphreys."

The banquet began with a beautiful rendition of the national anthems of the United States and Poland, sung by Dr. Helen Sikorski.

The invocation was intoned by the Most Reverend Thaddeus F. Zielinski, D.D., bishop of the Buffalo-Pittsburgh Diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church. The opening remarks were then given by the Honorable Matthew J. Jasen, justice of the New York State supreme court. Frank A. Sedita, mayor of Buffalo gave the welcome and greetings were extended by the Most Reverend Stanislaus J. Brzana, D.D., auxiliary to the bishop of Buffalo and general chairman of the Diocesan Millennium Committee.

We were subsequently entertained by the outstanding Paderewski Choir of Buffalo, directed by Michael Slominski. Remarks were then made by the Most Reverend James A. McNulty, D.D., bishop of Buffalo and the Vice President was wittily introduced by Henry J. Osinski, lay chairman of the celebration.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the names of the hosts and co-hosts of the millennium, since they were instrumental in making it the success that it was:

HOSTS

General chairman: Most Rev. Stanislaus J. Brzana, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Buffalo.

Honorary chairmen: Most Rev. Pius A. Benincasa, D.D., auxiliary bishop of Buffalo; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter J. Adamski, P.A.; Mr. John F. Aszkler, K.S.G.; Dr. Stephen A. Graczyk, K.S.G.

Vice chairmen: Very Rev. Msgr. William L. Wozniak; Rev. Joseph J. Stelmach.

Lay chairman: Mr. Henry J. Osinski.

Vice lay chairmen: Mr. Walter J. Urbanski, Miss Virginia E. Malecki.

Executive secretary: Very Rev. Msgr. Chester A. Meloch.

Secretary: Rev. Philip A. Jarmack.

Cohosts: Hon. Joseph P. Kuszynski, chairman; Mrs. Hedwig W. Tomasik, vice chairman; Mr. Andrew Ciolek, ticket chairman; Mr. Walter Lohr, reception chairman; Rev. Alan A. Zielinski, Rev. Stanley J. Ogorzaly, Mrs. Walter Lohr, Mr. Anthony Keller, Mayor Thaddeus Orzech, Dr. Richard Nowak, Dr. Helen Sikorski, Mr. Anthony A. Majka, Dr. Eugenia Bukowski, Mr. Matthew Czeladzinski, Mr. Casimir Lotarski, Mr. Matthew W. Pelczynski, Mr. Thaddeus Sielski, Mr. Adam J. Pilarz, Miss Eileen Tomaka, Mr. Edward Kazmierczak, Jr., Mr. Anthony Nitkowski.

This is a memorable year for those of Polish descent and in recognition of the importance this year holds for your fellow Polish Americans, I will on Monday next, introduce a bill authorizing the Post Office to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of the Polish millennium.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include an editorial from the Buffalo Courier Express, which is a good description of the significance this year has for all of us.

The editorial follows:

POLISH ANNIVERSARY DAY'S SIGNIFICANCE

This day promises to be a memorable one in local history, particularly for people of Polish descent, for it will focus civic attention on this year's celebration of a great anniversary for Poland. Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States, is here on a visit to participate in the ceremonies. Mayor Sedita has designated this Saturday as "The Millenium of Christianity of the Polish People Day." In presenting the proclamation to the Most Reverend Stanislaus J. Brzana, auxiliary bishop of the Buffalo Catholic Diocese and general chairman of the diocesan committee on the 1,000th anniversary of Polish Christianity, Mayor Sedita took official cognizance of Vice President Humphrey's visit as "giving nationwide recognition to our citizens."

There are about 40 million Catholics of Polish descent living the world over and many thousands in this preponderantly Catholic area. Their enthusiastic celebration of the Polish people's millenium is not self-glorification but a radiant reflection of the idealism of their cherished faith. They commemorate an historic miracle, the reorientation of a land once languishing in the darkness of idolatry to the light of the saving cross. The millenium marks Poland's adherence to Catholicism through 10 centuries—over half the length of the church's establishment on earth.

The 1,000th anniversary commemorates the Catholic baptism of Mieszko, a member of Poland's first historical dynasty, whose acceptance of Catholicism signaled the entry of the entire diocesan committee on the 1,000th Polish people into the church. Their unanimity of faith made for a polarization of Christian belief that has contributed to the spread of Christian civilization well over the globe.

Poland's special loyalty to the blessed mother of Christ has fortified it for years with indomitable resistance to the tyranny of communism in a way to compel the admiration of the world. As it has held fast to the faith, it has served as an exemplar to all nations to uphold Christian belief against infidel aggression. Thus the millenium of the Polish people holds significance for everyone who believes in the dignity of the human spirit and in its aspiration to freedom under God.

Weather Modification Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the effects of weather modification activities continue to concern many citizens, including those in western Maryland. At a meeting which I sponsored in Hagerstown last November 11, Dr. F. W. Reichelderfer, retired Chief of the Weather Bureau, discussed the current status of the science with a group of interested citizens. After reviewing the growth of weather modification research since 1946, Dr. Reichelderfer listed the many climatic factors which have not been analyzed with precision, and concluded that current weather modification activities still involve many uncertainties.

One hindrance to progress is a lack of full information about all weather-modifying activities conducted in this country by public and private authorities and individuals. I have introduced a bill which would require reports to the Commerce Department from all persons engaging in such activities, and hope the Congress will consider the Mathias bill during this session. The establishment of a central registry of information has already been endorsed in a Weather Bureau report.

The need for a full review of American weather modification research grows more pressing every day, as more and more activities and experiments are being undertaken. In an article in the Baltimore Sun of December 31, 1965, Ralph H. Keenan summarized the many types of study now underway, and the many large questions which remain to be approached. He concluded:

> Once man learns how to predict next month's weather with accuracy, then he can say something intelligent about weather control. That means man has a long way to go.

Mr. Kennan's interesting article follows:

THE PIPEDREAM OF CLIMATE CONTROL

(By Ralph H. Kennan)

Man may be able to change the course of hurricanes or destroy tornadoes within the next decade or so, but large-scale climate control is strictly science fiction.

Dr. J. Murray Mitchell, Jr., project scientist with the Weather Bureau's climate change project, feels that the experts have a lot to learn before they can even theorize properly on ways to control the earth's climate.

Dr. Mitchell notes that limited climate control is already in being and much of it by accident. Large cities, such as Baltimore, already warm their summers ever so slightly just by being built up and spread over a large area. Swamp draining has changed local weather conditions in some areas just a bit, and the output of carbon dioxide—from factories, engines, and other forms of combustion—has increased and has produced a measurable warming in the atmosphere.

The carbon dioxide accumulates in the atmosphere and serves as a sort of celestial greenhouse, but scientists estimate the atmosphere's carbon dioxide content has been increased only 10 percent in the last century.

Research is being done on ways to change the course of hurricanes such as the one which struck the southeastern United States recently and did extensive damage to New Orleans. But controlling such a storm is still a long way off.

Experimental techniques are under study that may lead to destroying tornadoes, but once one tornado is knocked out, another is created by the force that the first one left behind.

Dr. Mitchell feels that cloud seeding has been greatly overrated in the last several years and suggests that some of the claims made about its rain-producing possibilities are unfounded. He notes that mountain clouds can be seeded to produce precipitation but that other clouds, especially those over the Great Plains, are not responsive to seeding to any appreciable extent.

The basis for thinking about large-scale climate control is readjusting the circulation of wind and weather over a hemisphere. Prevailing winds are a result of temperature differences in various zones of latitude. Theoretically, these winds could be rerouted either by adding heat or taking it away. But because the earth receives energy—heat—from the sun at the rate of several hundred thousand super-sized hydrogen bombs every day of the year, man would have to find additional energy sources to work any appreciable effect on the wind direction.

The Russians have proposed setting up a giant mirror in space to reflect the sun's energy onto the dark side of the earth as one way to adjust the climate. They have also proposed pumping warm water from the Pacific Ocean into the Bering Sea to melt the ice cap at the North Pole. And there are suggestions that nuclear energy could be used to heat sections of the ocean in an effort to modify climate on a grand scale.

Dr. Mitchell sets these proposals aside as ridiculous, calling them science fiction in terms of what man is either able to do or what he knows about weather as a basis for anticipating the effect of such undertakings even if they were possible.

If man wanted to change ocean currents—using nuclear bombs to change the floor of the ocean—he might possibly be able to reroute the gulf stream or modify the Japanese current. Either might have beneficial effects on North America, or either might not. Man simply does not know enough about these things to predict with accuracy what really would happen or what sort of chain-reaction climate change he might bring about. Man also might wind up with an ocean with a high radioactive content that would be anything but beneficial.

There have been suggestions that nuclear energy might be used to blow dust into the atmosphere the way volcanic eruptions do. This dust serves in some ways like an umbrella for a while, producing a cooling effect. But because the dust would swing around the earth for several years before dissipating, it would be virtually impossible either to estimate the effect of the cooling or really to assemble the necessary nuclear energy in one place.

Other proposals have called for melting the polar ice cap as a way to warm the earth's weather. Dr. Mitchell points out that scientific estimates call for the use of 30 million 10-megaton hydrogen bombs to melt the Greenland ice cap alone, an energy requirement that puts that idea in the science fiction category.

Melting the polar cap by spreading it with dark-colored material like coal dust has also been proposed, the idea being that the darker color of the cap would cause the sun to melt it eventually. Dr. Mitchell suggests that even if this would do the job, the material needed would add up to 1 billion tons of coal just to produce a cover one-fiftieth of an inch thick. The United States produces that much coal in about 2 years.

Some still insist that man's nuclear testing has done things to the world's weather, but Dr. Mitchell points out that no nuclear bomb made has enough force to bring such a change about. While there are fluctuations in weather and climate, they cannot be attributed to the bomb-testing program.

He notes that the total energy of all nuclear bombs fired off so far by the United States and the Soviet Union amounts to the energy received by the earth as sunlight every 20 seconds. A similar amount of energy is added as solar heat to the world's atmosphere every 2½ hours just to maintain the world's wind circulation against loss by friction. Fourteen hundred times as much energy could theoretically raise the world's temperature momentarily by 1 degree, which would then be lost within a few hours.

Dr. Mitchell notes that the average hurricane during its lifetime—10 days to 2 weeks—expends energy roughly equivalent to 500 of the largest nuclear bombs yet developed. Scientists estimate that this energy is about the same as would be provided by firing off 2½ Nagasaki-type bombs every second of the storm's life.

In passing, Dr. Mitchell adds that since the test ban has been in effect, there has been a slight cooling trend evident worldwide, but he ascribes this to coincidence and insists he is not entirely sure whether the trend should be called a trend. He'd rather call it a fluctuation.

He suggests that climate control on a small scale will be feasible to some extent in terms of irrigation, swamp drainage or more sophisticated procedures as yet far from perfected as changing the course of hurricances away from populated areas.

But large-scale climate control is so much pipedreaming, at least for the foreseeable future. He suggests that bending the climate may prove possible in certain areas under certain conditions but is certain that the methods eventually found practical—or even possible—remain to be suggested.

He also feels that because so little is really known about the atmosphere and about weather and the effects of various components of weather on the total picture that man will have to do a great amount of learning before he can even theorize practical means for causing any measurable, large-scale change.

Once man learns how to predict next month's weather with accuracy, then he can say something intelligent about weather control. That means man has a long way to go. Accurate forecasts are now in the 1- and 2-day range although the Weather Bureau can make some educated guesses about the weather 2 and 3 weeks ahead.

What Hope for a Beautiful America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, of January 9, 1966, meriting careful consideration not only by the Members of the Congress, but also of the citizenry of our great land.

The time of decision for preservation of the magnificent American outdoor heritage is at hand. If we are to save this heritage—to preserve the pure water, clean air, glorious mountains, timber, soil, and wildlife—the Congress, the legislatures of the several States, and our local administrators must know that the time is now.

The editorial follows.

WHAT HOPE FOR A BEAUTIFUL AMERICA?

There may yet be a fighting chance for the preservation of "America the Beautiful."

This is true because, for the first time, Americans seem to be waking up to a realization of how close we are to losing it.

We are beginning to see what we have done to the natural surroundings that are our heritage. We see marginal farmlands and surplus crops wasting away the soil. We see drought and flood following in the wake of the destruction of forest and prairie. We see wild plant and animal life sorely threatened. We see our lakes and watercourses carrying more and more filth. We see our air soiled by the noxious fumes of our material progress.

We sense that we have been blind to the fact that we are a part of the balance of nature, not beings standing apart. We begin to understand that the old American ideal of taming the wilderness, of conquering nature, constitutes a cruel deception that we have practiced on ourselves. We realize that we have overconquered, overtamed, overkilled, overexploited. We even glimpse the possibility that, like the great civilizations of the past, what some are calling the world's most overdeveloped nation could perish in its own filth in a land stripped and despoiled of all that had once made it great and bountiful.

It is against this background of a new awareness on the part of the American people that one should view the record of the last session of Congress, which earned the sobriquet "conservation Congress." It is against this background, especially, that one should view the call to husband and beautify the land that has been sounded by one of the most politically astute Presidents in history and by his wife—a call that already is bearing fruit in terms of detailed studies such as the Potomac watershed report made public yesterday.

The legislative response to the proconservation mood of the Nation so far is impressive. The Water Quality Act of 1965 represents the beginning of a really meaningful attack on pollution. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 bears the same relationship to water supply. Research on desalinating water has been stepped up. A clean air act signals an attack in that quarter. The Food and Agricultural Act of 1965 aims at accelerating the retirement and preservation of soil not required or not suitable for crops. A program of highway beautification has been at least begun. A hopper full of laws has added park and recreation lands to serve the growing need for places where people can flee the pressures of our increasingly urban life. Still other legislation aims at restoring the spawning runs of fish in our rivers, protecting decimated wildlife species and their habitat, curbing floods, ameliorating the effects of strip mining, overgrazing, overforesting.

This and much more has come to pass in response to a steadily mounting public resolve to reverse, if possible, the effects of a century of misuse and exploitation. And there is every indication that the second session of the 89th Congress will continue the job so well begun by preserving some of our few as yet unspoiled wild rivers, as yet uncut virgin forests and as yet unextinguished wildlife species, and add even more sorely needed recreational areas to the national stockpile.

But, before we congratulate ourselves too freely, we should remember a few things. One is that what Congress has recently accomplished or may be about to accomplish represents a long-overdue backlog piled up by Congresses and administrations that did little or nothing to reverse the trend toward destruction of the land. Some of the legislation recently passed was needed in William McKinley's time, in Theodore Roosevelt's time or in Calvin Coolidge's time, but wasn't passed because a majority of Americans either didn't know or didn't care.

Another thing to remember is that what is now being done is only a beginning, in some cases only a small beginning. The task of controlling pollution alone is staggering, for example. The problem of stabilizing water resources is equally formidable.

Perhaps the greatest problem of all, however, lies in the character of the machinery that is expected to carry the job forward once the President and Congress have provided the stimulus, authority and funds. Unfortunately, at present we must look for tangible and visible progress to a welter of agencies that through pork-barrel politics, jealousies, trial and error, compromise and Parkinson's law share conservation responsibility. Several agencies with different allegiances and viewpoints plan and build dams, for example. Public forests are administerd by one department, other public lands by another. Responsibility for water resources lies in one place, for water pollution abatement in another. That the agencies involved frequently work at cross purposes is common knowledge. Equally well-known is the tendency of many agencies to acquire know-how without at the same time acquiring know-whether. It is fine to make the desert bloom like a rose, but to make it bloom with surplus cotton is quite another matter.

What is needed is a single executive force to give meaning to what is being promised and legislated,—an executive force that can truly coordinate the many-fronted effort that must be made.

A bill introduced by Senator Moss, of Utah, last August may offer the type of solution we sorely need. In the main its provisions follow the thinking of the Hoover Commission. It would cut to the heart of the problem by substituting for the present Interior Department a Department of Natural Resources, transferring to it most if not all Federal functions having to do with conservation. The Secretary of Natural Resources would be charged with developing an overall plan for our land and water, taking in all, not just some, considerations.

To apply the words of Gifford Pinchot, founder of the Forest Service and the first top-flight professional conservationist to serve in the Federal Government, each agency at present tends to "ride its own hobby in its own direction." The conservation of natural resources, Pinchot wrote, "is one single question with many parts * * * one great central problem of the use of the earth for the good of man."

The problem is unlikely to be solved until one man, with authority to act, takes charge.

A Tired American Speaks Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was read to the East Cleveland Kiwanis Club on Monday, November 29, 1965, by Judge Stanton Addams, of the East Cleveland Municipal Court. A copy was sent to me by Mr. Paul F. Adsit, secretary of the Cleveland Association of Building Owners and Managers.

Believing that my colleagues will appreciate the contents of this editorial, I would like to share it:

[From the Germantown Courier, Nov. 25, 1965 (reprinted from the Rock County Herald, Luverne, Minn.)]

A TIRED AMERICAN SPEAKS OUT

I am a tired American.

I'm tired of being called the ugly American.

I'm tired of having the world panhandlers use my country as a whipping boy 365 days a year.

I am a tired American—weary of having American embassies and information centers stoned, burned, and sacked by mobs operating under orders from dictators who preach peace and breed conflict.

I am a tired American—weary of being lectured by General de Gaulle (who never won a battle), who poses as a second Jehovah in righteousness and wisdom.

I am a tired American—weary of Nasser and all the other bloodsucking leeches who bleed Uncle Sam white and who kick him on the shins and yank his beard if the flow falters.

I am a tired American—weary of the beatniks who say they should have the right to determine what laws of the land they are willing to obey.

I am a tired American—fed up with the mobs of scabby faced, long-haired youths and short-haired girls who claim they represent the new wave of America and who sneer at the old-fashioned virtues of honesty, integrity, and morality on which America grew to greatness.

I am a tired American—weary unto death of having my tax dollars go to dictators who play both sides against the middle with threats of what will happen if we cut off the golden stream of dollars.

I am a tired American—who is tired of supporting families who haven't known any other source of income other than government relief checks for three generations.

I am a tired American—who is getting madder by the minute at the filth peddlers who have launched Americans in an obscenity race—who try to foist on us the belief that filth is an integral part of culture—in the arts, the movies, literature, the stage.

I am a tired American—weary of the bearded bums who tramp the picket lines and the sit-ins—who prefer Chinese communism to capitalism—who see no evil in Castro, but sneer at President Johnson as a threat to peace.

I am a tired American—who has lost all patience with that civil rights group which is showing propaganda movies on college campuses from coast to coast. Movies denouncing the United States. Movies made in Communist China.

I am a tired American—who is angered by the self-righteous breastbeater critics of America, at home and abroad, who set impossible yardsticks for the United States but never apply the same standards to the French, the British, the Russians, the Chinese.

I am a tired American—sickened by the slack-jawed bigots who wrap themselves in bed sheets in the dead of night and roam the countryside looking for innocent victims.

* * * * *

I am a tired American who resents those who try to peddle the belief in schools and colleges that capitalism is a dirty word and that free enterprise and private intiative are only synonyms for greed.

They say they hate capitalism, but they are always right at the head of the line demanding their share of the American way of life.

I am a tired American—real tired of those who are trying to sell me the belief that America is not the greatest nation in all the world—a generous-hearted nation—a nation dedicated to the policy of trying to help the have-nots achieve some of the good things that our system of free enterprise brought about.

I am an American who gets a lump in his throat when he hears the "Star-Spangled Banner" and who holds back tears when he hears those chilling high notes on the brassy trumpets when Old Glory reaches the top of the flagpole.

I am a tired American who thanks a merciful Lord that he was so lucky to be born an American citizen—a nation under God, with truly mercy and justice for all.

Needed: Men To Match Mountains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 11, it was my pleasure to accompany Mr. and Mrs. John Borzea of my hometown of Rock Springs, Wyo., to the first annual President's Conservation Awards banquet sponsored by the National Wildlife Federation and Sears Foundation, which was held at the Statler Hilton.

My host, John Borzea, received the honor that evening of a Governor's Conservation Award, and it was my particular pleasure to observe the awards to others who have made notable contributions to the field of conservation which is so vital to everyone in the Nation.

The shocking blight which confronts the urban areas of America was touched upon in the main speech by Secretary Freeman. I could not help but contrast the problems of megalopolis America to the beauty of life in those areas of the Rocky Mountain West where we still have, as in Wyoming, considerably less than four human beings per square mile, where we still have clean air and clean water, and hope to keep it that way.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but ponder the historical presence of western problems of economic growth. In a book now a best seller in the West, the "History of Wyoming," by T. A. Larson, we find that the problems confronting Wyoming were precisely the same 75 years ago as today. They were, first, how to maintain the payrolls of its few industries; second, how tc maintain the population growth; and third, how to attract more payroll from the public as well as the private sector.

Secretary Freeman's speech touches on much of a program which can protect a worthwhile natural environment for society. But until man learns to move from the megalopolis environment, and to love and live in harmony with an environment of higher elevations and of lower populations, the problems may be ever with us.

In any event, I believe that Secretary Freeman's speech is one of the best in my experience in Washington, and I am happy and proud to attach it to my remarks at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN PREPARED FOR DELIVERY TO THE FIRST ANNUAL PRESIDENT'S CONSERVATION AWARDS BANQUET SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION AND THE SEARS FOUNDATION, JANUARY 11, 1966, AT THE STATLER HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We live in an age of revolution.

We have long enjoyed the benefits of the abundance revolution in agriculture, for no person in this country today need go hungry.

The scientific and technological revolution enables man to walk in space today and consider walking on the surface of the moon tomorrow.

Electronic computers in dust-free, humidity-controlled, air-conditioned rooms have launched the cybernetic revolution and these machines now produce other machines, operate factories, regulate traffic, improve access to man's vast storehouse of information, write payrolls and talk with other computers doing the same thing.

And here tonight we are witnessing the beginning of another revolution—the conservation revolution. At least, a revolution in the concept of conservation.

A decade ago, the National Wildlife Federation might have given an award to the individual who did the most to preserve and protect wildlife.

But tonight the National Wildlife Federation concludes its first annual awards program with an emphasis on unity of purpose in conservation making awards for wildlife, soil, water, and forest conservation.

Awards in six other categories of individual achievement in conservation, together with the four at-large national awards dramatize the diversity of conservation activities—and the unifying purpose of guarding our renewable resources so they are available in undiminished supply to serve many uses today and tomorrow—and for all time to come.

It is an eloquent response to the plea which President Johnson made a year ago. In his message on natural beauty, he said:

"Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."

This is a wise and perceptive statement. I will attempt tonight to interpret and apply it as broadly and meaningfully as the President intended. The point I want to make is that when true conservation principles are put in operation we will cease to crowd ourselves into vast cities, and more and more Americans will return to the countryside to live and work. When that takes place America will be a better nation.

There is today great ferment among conservation groups; ferment caused not by competition, but rather by a new vision of what cooperation can accomplish—and the disaster which can befall this great Nation in its absence.

THE ASCS

A decade ago, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior would not have traveled 3,000 miles across country to sit down together with local people to discuss future development plans for land, water, timber, and wildlife resources in the area surrounding the community. But that is what Secretary Udall and I did last week.

A decade ago, a newspaper in North Dakota would not have written that "By far the largest operation in creating and restoring (wildlife) habitat on privately owned lands has been conducted through the agricultural conservation program administered by the (USDA's) Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service."

But today, ASCS the farmers commodity program arm is spending much of its time working with USDA's Soil Conservation Service, local soil and water conservation districts, and with State game and fish agencies to help private landowners including the use of incentive payments to produce wildlife along with farm crops on their acres.

A decade ago, the advice of wildlife groups would not have been sought in establishing management programs and policies on land moving to other uses than crop production—nor would local communities and counties be encouraged and helped to convert cropland into much needed parks and recreation facilities.

But today, through the recently enacted cropland adjustment program, that is happening. We are assisting farmers to convert as much as 40 million acres of cropland to uses which will provide the Nation new access to the outdoors.

It is appropriate that I take this important occasion to announce appointments to a wildlife advisory board which will counsel the Department as we develop procedures under the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 to improve wildlife. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is working closely with the USDA to assist local communities and county governments to acquire land under this program for recreational development.

DEPARTMENTAL COOPERATION

A decade ago, Soil Conservation Service would not have joined with Interior's Fish and Wildlife Bureau to strengthen management and prevent policy conflicts within Public Law 566 small watershed projects. But this kind of cooperation is almost routine today not only for wildlife protection but also for recreation and for water for industrial and community uses—all conservation goals now financed by the small watershed program. Community organizations seeking to expand uses for renewable resources are being encouraged to participate in sponsoring and planning watershed projects.

A decade ago, the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, Defense, and Agriculture did not review together the use of pesticides on public lands so wildlife would be preserved while other resources are being protected. But we are doing this today; and the USDA has stepped up its research activities to develop nonchemical means as well as safer chemicals to control pests and plant diseases. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Interior, and the USDA also have begun a broad cooperative research programs to determine and gage the effects of pesticides use in human health, animal life, and on soil and water to obtain vital information lacking today.

Two decades ago, there were widespread concern that the Potomac, as with other major rivers of the United States, was becoming increasingly polluted and someday would be little more than an open sewer—inhospitable to fish and wildlife and too dangerous for recreation. For 20 years too little has been done, and our worst fears have been realized.

POTOMAC RIVER PLANS

But now a comprehensive Potomac River Basin plan has been prepared under the guidance of Secretary Udall, at the direction of President Johnson, which will employ the resources and skills of many State and Federal agencies. This plan, which can serve as a model for other regions to follow under the River Basin Planning Act, can help to not only clean up the Potomac but also provide unparalleled wildlife and recreation opportunities in upstream areas and in nearby portions of national forests lands.

Five years ago, when smaller communities throughout the American countryside faced serious water shortages or growing pollution problems, there was not much community leaders could do.

Plagued with declining population and an inadequate tax base, these communities usually found that credit resources to finance basic community improvements were not available. Today, the Congress has greatly enlarged the program of the USDA to assist these communities to establish and improve water systems and sewage treatment facilities.

A decade ago, the need to develop many more outdoor recreation opportunities concerned only a few people—among them, was a new Governor of Minnesota. Yet anyone who took time to study the rapidly increasing recreation uses of parks and forests—State and national—could see what was coming.

TRUE MULTIPLE USE

In the last 10 years, the States have greatly increased their investment and in recent years the Federal Government has acted on a wide front to enlarge the capacity of land, timber, and water resources in the public domain to provide outdoor recreation. A massive survey of outdoor recreation needs has been completed, and a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has been established in the Department of Interior.

The Congress recently created a number of national recreation areas and in 1964 passed the Wilderness Preservation Act giving permanent wilderness status to 9.5 million acres of primeval America—including almost 2 million acres it has been my privilege and pleasure to move into that category by executive order of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Interior through the national parks and the USDA through the National Forests have greatly enlarged the recreation potential of public lands. Today the USDA can provide financial assistance to farmers who wish to develop recreation as an income producing crop to supplement their farm income.

Thus, in recent years dramatic progress has taken place in conservation policies and programs. It is marked by new emphasis on a unified approach and a new spirit of cooperation among groups and agencies, private and public alike, concerned with the Nation's renewable resources—and by an emphasis on wise and effective use, with greater concern for the needs of individual resource users.

Thus, a society which began soil and water conservation programs primarily as a means of protecting these resources for agricultural uses by those who owned the land now finds that the same principles and techniques must be applied to a vastly wider canvass of problems and needs.

Agriculture alone cannot support a vital and growing rural community that wishes to offer its young people an equally wide range of job and income opportunities, public services and cultural and recreational outlets as they can find in metropolitan areas. And the urban areas, reaching out to consume land and water in prodigious quantity are finding that they must mend their ways for they have misuesd and wasted land and water to the point where life in the megalopolis increasingly is becoming more costly complicat and less satisfactory.

It is crystal clear that as a Nation we have to make a given quantity of land, water, timber and wildlife resources serve more than one purpose at the same time. Multiple use on private as well as public land will become an ever increasing necessity of life.

As a conservationist, I have always believed in this basic concept. As a public servant concerned with the kind of a society we build for ourselves and for our children, I know that we must practice it as a matter of commonsense—as a matter of conserving the values of a free society.

A GROWING NATION

Within the time span of one generation—within the next 35 years, the population of the United States likely will grow by another 100 million persons. We already are having a difficult time making the renewable resources we possess in great abundance serve the needs of 200 million Americans. What are we going to do when the demands of another 100 million people are placed on the same quantity of renewable resources?

This is the challenge that confronts the true conservationist today.

And I do not believe we will meet that challenge unless we begin now as a matter of National policy to spread out—to create and maintain greater opportunity for more people to live good lives where open space exists—rather than bunching up in our great cities.

I am not suggesting that we abandon the city and dismantle it. The great cities of America will continue to grow.

But I am suggesting that we should begin now to create other alternatives than megalopolis as a place to live. To crowd another 100 million bodies into the large metropolitan complexes is not wise. Our cities today face critical problems in trying to maintain a decent environment for those already there—let alone absorb another 100 million bodies.

The water shortages which struck New York City are more serious than those which a drought and shortage create. They are indicative of the difficulty which the megalopolis has in providing adequate services for its citizens.

In the recent power failure which struck the Northeast, the smaller communities were able to restore power much sooner than in New York City.

Smog—air pollution—no longer is the exclusive possession of Los Angeles, nor is air pollution any longer associated exclusively with heavy industrial concentrations. It is a blight which appears today wherever people crowd together. Washington, D.C., has very little industry, but there are days when smog mars the sunset over the Potomac.

When the commercial, business and cultural life of millions of people can be halted because of a dispute over transportation—and when the prospect of people driving to work threaten a traffic jam even worse than no transportation at all—then it is time to consider other alternatives than larger and larger urban complexes.

These conditions destroy the beauty and charm of the city; they erode the quality of life and the joy of living. And they are getting worse, not better.

We must, as President Johnson has said, practice creative conservation. We must not only restore what has been corrupted, but also inovate new techniques in the use of our renewable resources which will protect man's welfare and raise his spirit.

We must employ conservation to develop in rural America those conditions which will enable many more people than today to enjoy a better, more gracious, more abundant and healthful life. We must end the neglect of rural America.

As a place to live, rural America has great assets.

It has a growing number of adequate family farms—and a farming economy which will provide food and fiber abundance and contribute increasingly to a stable economic base for the local community.

It has space for new industry, for new homes and for outdoor recreation. It has water for communities and industry, for agriculture, for wildlife and for recreation. The programs which are becoming increasingly available at State and Federal levels can help insure the wise development and use of these resources.

And rural America has the time to make certain that the development and use of these resources is planned to create the maximum opportunity for a good life for millions of people.

Conservation alone—planning the wise use of our renewable resources—will not automatically create the broad range of job and income opportunities and related services and cultural and recreational activities which rural America must offer, but without conservation the conditons which will make for a brighter more meaningful life for millions more Americans in the countryside U.S.A. will not be possible.

Conservationists—regardless of their special interests—can provide critical leadership in the restless quest for a better way to live.

I would close tonight with a little verse that frequently races through my mind:

"Bring me men to match my mountains,
  Bring me men to match my plains,
 Men with empires in their purpose,
  And new eras in their brains."

Thank you and goodnight.

Worldwide Standards for Color Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, radio broadcasting and television in particular have become part of the American life. There are many facets of broadcasting technique contributing to the service being rendered to the American people.

It has been my pleasure to observe the progress and development in the broadcasting industry over the years. Today color television, profound and unique in broadcasting, is fast becoming the amazing technique for the American home.

Even television in itself is an achievement almost beyond description. The technology of color television is almost beyond conception of the average person, but still it is fast becoming an everyday part of our lives.

As has been the case with so many other developments in this country, this technique of color television is being developed in other nations and will, no doubt, become worldwide in a relatively short time.

It is becoming apparent now that there will be a need for worldwide standards for color TV. This need is obvious by the substantial discussion and consideration given to it at the recent International Telecommunications Conference in Geneva, which I had the privilege along with others to attend for a brief time as a delegate.

Dr. Paul F. Geren, State Department adviser on telecommunications and transportation until recently, has written a most interesting article which appeared in the Department of State Bulletin of October 11, 1965. This most interesting article of Dr. Geren's points out that "a radio beam takes no note of national boundaries." The special article also points out that as in all such technological changes, the utilization does not only belong to the field of science but to the area of international relations.

In view of the importance of this subject and the knowledge and experience of Dr. Geren both in the fields of communication and foreign service, I am pleased to include Dr. Geren's article in the Appendix of the RECORD and commend it to the attention of the Members. Even though it is technical, it is well written and points up some of the problems and difficulties for the future in this important field:

WORLDWIDE STANDARDS FOR COLOR TELEVISION

The amazing technology that has multiplied and diversified global communication possibilities has increased the demands on foreign policy. A radio beam takes no note of national boundaries, but it can only be transmitted internationally from facilities located in one nation and received by facilities in another. As in all technological change, how these facilities are arranged and coordinated belongs not only to the field of science but also to the area of international relations. Similarly, the arrangements between governments in the communications field influence for good or bad the freedom, the economy, and the efficiency of global communication.

The choice of color television standards offers a dramatic illustration of this thesis. As the nation with the greatest telecommunications resources, whose industry in 1953 was the first to operate color television broadcasts and now has equipped over 4 million homes to receive and over 550 stations to broadcast color television, the United States has considerable interest in the question of the standards chosen for transmission of programs from one country to another. The mutuality of government and industry interest is symbolized by a joint committee on color television.

Color television standards have been a subject since 1956 for Study Group XI of the International Radio Consultative Committee, abbreviated to CCIR from the initials of its French name. The CCIR is a permanent organ of the 127-member International Telecommunication Union (ITU) and, like its parent body, is concerned with facilitating international communications. The goal of the ITU is to help the people of the world talk and otherwise communicate with one another. The CCIR looks forward to a time, not many years distant, when color television will be widely available in many countries. Such a time casts its shadow on the present in the shape of the problem of compatibility of systems and technical standards.

Compatibility means the capacity of different systems to receive and transmit to and from one another. It has two aspects: the capacity of monochrome (black and white) sets to receive programs transmitted in color, and the capacity for color television program interchange between different countries. As the CCIR so accurately perceives, the time for action to secure compatibility is now, before governments, industries, and peoples in different countries invest great sums in incompatible systems.

Compatibility, or the lack of it, results from the choice of standards. A telephone in New York must have compatibility with an instrument in Copenhagen if persons in these two places are to talk to each other. Additional dimensions of compatibility are required for the worldwide direct-dialing telephone system now being developed. Compatibility of standards has been approached in telephones and in radio, but only to a much lesser extent in monochrome television. The difficulty in exchanging programs is compounded in the case of color television by the complexities inherent in color transmission. In general, the more complex the form of communication, the greater the planning required to achieve compatibility.

Such an achievement seems to come naturally in adjacent countries which communicate extensively. More than 50 percent of Canadian homes with television sets are within reach of direct television transmission from the United States. Similarly, many television sets in the United States are within range of Canadian television transmission. Because Canada and the United States employ compatible monochrome television standards, the receivers along both sides of the border can tune in programs from either side. Furthermore, when Canadian authorities recently announced the authorization of color television for Canada by 1967, they likewise made clear that the color system would coincide with the standards in use in the United States.

The Dutch view West German television, and vice versa, Luxembourg the French. East Germany may view West Germany's programs, and vice versa. This is because adjacent monochrome systems are by and large compatible.

The long-distance exchange of programs via the Early Bird satellite between the United States and Europe employs cameras and gear of the American system in Europe to transmit programs to the United States and vice versa, whether in black and white or color. The direct exchange of programs between the United States and Europe would require a standards converter. The greater the degree of compatibility, the simpler the standards converter and the less the resultant technical degradation of the original television picture. No satisfactory converter has yet been developed for exchange of programs between basically incompatible systems.

DEADLOCK AT VIENNA MEETING

Some progress toward the adoption of worldwide standards for color television was expected at the CCIR meeting in Vienna March 24–April 7, 1965. Study Group XI had been assigned this question, and despite a basic incompatibility built into the monochrome systems, its members were unwilling to abandon the objective of a common system for transmitting color. The representatives at Vienna were persons of technical competence, and they sought a decision based on engineering facts.

However, this meeting was preceded and attended by remarkable events in other than the technological field. On March 22, 2 days before the conference in Vienna was to open, France and the U.S.S.R. announced conclusion of an agreement to unite their efforts in the development and introduction of a joint system of color television based on the French SECAM system and its standards, and General de Gaulle subsequently hailed the agreement in a speech at the Elysée.

At the Vienna meeting, the chairman of the Committee polled its members in writing on the question: What system do you choose for a public color television service? Twenty-one countries replied in favor of the SECAM system: Algeria, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Cameroon, Czechoslovakia, France, Gabon, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg, Mali, Monaco, Morocco, Niger, Poland, Rumania, Spain, Tunisia, Ukraine, U.S.S.R., and Upper Volta. Four of these countries were not even present but had their votes cast by others.

The following 18 countries replied in favor of the QAM system, or one of its variants, whose technical features and name are explained below: Austria, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and United States.

The nations which voted for SECAM have some 18 million television sets in operation, while the nations voting for QAM have 146 million, or 8 times as many. The SECAM list includes no country which presently has color television in regular service, while the QAM list includes the two countries which do: the United States, which has operated commercial color television since 1953, and Japan, which has had such a service since 1960.

As a result of this split poll of the participants, the CCIR could not make a recommendation for a single system. The deadlocked meeting's communique stated:

"All participants are concerned that efforts to secure agreement on a single system must continue and, indeed, the procedure of the Committee will permit the subject, as it then stands, to be examined in Oslo at the 11th Plenary Assembly of 1966."

In view of the clear need to agree on a universal system and the present division on the means, the color television question has gathered inevitable controversy.

THE SECAM SYSTEM

The two systems, QAM and SECAM, differ in the method of transmitting the color information. In the QAM family of systems, which includes the color system used in the United States, the technique is to transmit simultaneously the two color signals, hue and saturation, using quadrature amplitude modulation—hence the initials QAM. In the SECAM, the color signals are transmitted sequentially, using frequency modulation of the color subcarrier. A memory system in the TV receiver stores the color information, which is then reassembled to produce the color called for by the camera. This explains the initials SECAM, which stand for sequential à memoire. Because of the added delay line and switching circuitry, SECAM receivers are likely in the present state of technology to be more expensive to manufacture. There is also a grave engineering defect: The SECAM cannot make use of the powerful concept of constant luminance, which protects against noise and random interference.

THE QAM SYSTEM

The QAM family includes several variants, all employing the simultaneous transmission of the color system but each having individual characteristics. The oldest of these in point of time, the NTSC, is based on the recommendations of the National Television System Committee (NTSC), a U.S. group of engineering and administrative representatives of the television industry. These color television standards were established by order of the U.S. Federal Communications Commission in 1953, after an earlier false start with the field sequential system. The adoption of the NTSC standards in the United States represents a consensus of industry engineers achieved by thorough field tests. The NTSC standards were approved by the Canadian Radio Technical Planning Board in 1956. The Japanese Government adopted the NTSC standards in 1960 for the regular commercial service which began in that year.

In the United States, Canada, and Japan both color and black and white systems are 525 lines/60 fields. These designations specify the number of lines in a television picture and the number of times per second the picture is scanned on the screen. The systems of color television with which the United Kingdom is experimenting are variants of the NTSC, modified for compatibility with the existing black and white systems using 405 lines/50 fields and 625 lines/50 fields. The Netherlands is likewise experimenting with a variant of the NTSC using 625 lines/50 fields.

A third member of the QAM family is the PAL, which has been developed in the Federal Republic of Germany. The PAL system transmits the color information simultaneously but alternately, thus reversing the phase of the color signals.

All the variants of the QAM employ the quadrature amplitude modulation technique. The NTSC, whether 525 lines/60 fields, 405 lines/50 fields, or 625 lines/50 fields, and the PAL color signals can be received in monochrome on existing black and white receivers in use in the respective countries, and programs in color can be exchanged between NTSC and PAL systems that use the same field rates by the use of a simple standards converter. At present, color signals transmitted by SECAM can be received on conventional monochrome sets on the same scanning standard. Color signals transmitted by SECAM, however, cannot be received on color sets of any variant of the QAM system. A standards converter to permit exchange between SECAM and QAM systems has yet to be invented. Should a converter be invented, it would have to be more complex than the simple converters which now make possible the program exchange between the NTSC and the PAL when the field repetition rates are the same.

The achievement of compatibility in color television systems has been complicated by the existence of difference in field repetition rates: 60 fields per second in the United States, Canada, Japan, and some countries of Latin America and Asia, and 50 fields per second in most of Europe and many countries of Latin America, Asia, and Africa. A complete identity of standards is impossible between two countries employing differing field repetition rates, but a measure of compatibility is possible. In spite of different scanning standards, it is worthwhile to strive for reduction to an absolute minimum of the number of variants of a system between which conversion is required. Theoretically this minimum is two: one variant for the countries using 50-cycle power and one for those using 60-cycle.

CHOICE OF STANDARDS ONLY A BEGINNING

In view of the dynamic character of color television technology, many nations are postponing a choice of a system, especially because they do not accord color television high priority. This is a tempting position for any nation now without color television to adopt, since in the long run the character of the choices to be made may be altered by technological development. However, as Lord Keynes reminded us, in the long run we are all dead.

One thing is sure: When a nation fixes a date to begin color television operations, it is not possible to play "Hamlet" in the choice between systems. It is impossible to begin operations on no system at all, and it is inefficient and uneconomic to begin operations—as contrasted to experiments—on several systems.

While the choice of a system makes possible a beginning, it does not freeze the possibility of improvement in the end product seen in color on the television screen. The choice of system defines the basic characteristics of the color signal, but leaves open the future for all improvements in the components and circuitry. Indeed, the improvements in color television in the United States have all been made within the NTSC variant of the QAM system, adopted in 1953.

The suggestion made by some advocates of SECAM that the QAM–NTSC has exhausted its technological possibilities is a reckless conjecture rather than a technological fact. One is reminded of Karl Marx's claim, made in the latter half of the 19th century, that capitalism had exhausted its possibilities. This was before various countries which he described as capitalistic had brought forth X-ray, radio, the automobile, and the airplane—to name a few of the unexhausted possibilities.

The dynamic character of the U.S. television industry is a convincing argument that QAM–NTSC standards are consistent with accelerated technological advance. Among the recent gains are the trend toward all-solid-state components, the development of rare-earth phosphors for kinescopes, the production of a four-tube color television camera, the production of rectangular shadow-mask color picture tubes making available wider deflection, and advanced work on camera tubes with electrostatic focusing and deflection.

On the technological horizon are possibilities more amazing still, such as the introduction of integrated circuitry and the conversion of color television from analog to digital transmission. In the case of the United States the choice of QAM–NSTC standards was not the end but only a part of the beginning.

THE U.S. POSITION

The choice of color television standards involves technological, economic, psychological, and political factors. Political policy in this realm must obviously take account of the technological facts. It disregards them at its peril.

We in the United States believe that observance of the three following principles will serve to further the objectives of worldwide standards:

First, no limits should be placed on further research and technological investigation of color television. Field tests of QAM and SECAM systems should be available for countries while they are in the stage of choosing a system. After choice has been made, the system must be kept open for all the technological improvements which may be made in components.

Second, the progress already achieved in the QAM–NTSC system in operation in the United States since 1953 and in Japan since 1960 should be appropriately available for other countries which wish to use it. The means of sharing this branch of progress are the sale of equipment and components, the licensing of technology manufacturing rights, and the entire battery of methods by which the television industry operates across national boundaries. The relatively long headstart in color television enjoyed by the U.S. industry is a factor of great significance. Considerations of both private profit and public international responsibility indicate that the advance should be shared.

Third, the fact that an identity of color television systems cannot be immediately achieved should not prevent the best efforts in the direction of maximizing compatibility. If more than one set of standards are to obtain, the number should be the smallest possible and the compatibility should be the greatest possible. The real choice the world faces is whether to move in the direction of the greatest possible measure of compatibility or by default to reverse the direction and proliferate incompatible systems.

Statement of Commissioner Erwin N. Griswold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, one of the great teachers and scholars of the law in our time is the distinguished dean of the Harvard Law School, Erwin N. Griswold. Dean Griswold is also a member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Recently, the Civil Rights Commission has published a report entitled "Law Enforcement; A Report on Equal Protection in the South." Included therein is a separate statement by Commissioner Erwin N. Griswold. This work is typical of the incisive, consise style which has always characterized the writings of Dean Griswold. In this statement is contained a challenge to the legal profession of the country in its activities in the field of civil rights. Too often, lawlessness has been associated with the civil rights movement. Nowhere in his statement does Dean Griswold condone lawlessness, but he states with emphasis and clarity his belief that when the law is applied in all sections of our country to all citizens without fear or favor, then those interested in "equal rights for all citizens, will surely present their grievances to the courts and stay off the streets." Since I regard this as an eloquent and timely appeal to the conscience of all Americans, and an appeal to all lawyers in their special role as officers of our courts, I present it with pride for reading by my colleagues.

The statement follows:

SEPARATE STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER ERWIN N. GRISWOLD

As a lawyer who is proud of his profession, and as a legal educator who is concerned with the development of high professional standards in young lawyers, I have a deep concern in the administration of justice. It is clear that the administration of justice in the South today is one of the key elements in the most fundamental domestic problem of the United States. Too long and too often has this fact been overlooked by citizens and by lawyers throughout the country. It is my earnest hope that this report of the Commission on Civil Rights will focus the attention of thoughtful people everywhere on the realities of this problem and, that especially, it will lead to an awakening of awareness and responsibility on the part of citizens and lawyers of the South.

As far as the ordinary Negro in the South is concerned, justice is not administered by the Supreme Court of the United States, or even by the supreme courts of the several States. The place where State power makes its impact on him is when he encounters sheriffs, and their deputies, and police officers, and court officers, and magistrates and justices of the peace. From experience he tends to look on these officers of the State not as protectors but as persons to be feared. He knows that many of them will exercise the discretion committed to them in such a way as to demean him and to deny him equality under the law. The Negro who knows his place ordinarily has little trouble—in his place. The Negro who is aware of the rights conferred on him by the Constitution and laws of the United States—and those who seek to help him—repeatedly encounters the long arm of the local law designed to intimidate him and to discourage him from any attempt to break out of the subservient place to which he has been assigned by the practices and the customs of the dominant elements of the community.

This injustice appears in mass arrests, such as those of the freedom riders who sought only to assert a simple citizen's right. It is found in the decision to arrest, or not to arrest, when a small group of Negroes walking to register to vote becomes an illegal parade. When there is some offense, the white man receives a warning, or is ignored. The Negro is arrested with all the consequences of arrest. Discriminaiton is found in bail practices. White persons are released on their own recognizance, or with modest bail easily arranged; Negroes often have a higher bail and restrictions are imposed, such as a refusal to accept cash bail, or requiring bail supported only by unencumbered real estate—which is hard to find in a Negro community. Very often bail cannot be arranged from bonding companies in so-called civil rights cases because local agents will not sign the bonds.

The Negro's plight is found in police brutality—perhaps almost as important, in police discourtesy, in constant reminders in many ways, large and small, that he is a subordinate, lacking the full dignity of a man. It is found in decisions of the minor judiciary, where the Negro goes to jail and the white man is released on parole or pays a fine. It is found in social practices still tolerated in many courts, where seating is still segregated, and where Negroes are addressed only by their first names. It is found in juries, where, by one device or another, Negroes are rarely—often never—found seated on the jury which actually hears a case with racial aspects. It is found in the fact that a Negro convicted of rape is usually given a death sentence, while this is rarely the fate of a white man convicted of this offense.

Looming in the background of all this, is the fact, well known to Negroes, that a white man who harms them will rarely, if ever, be severely punished. The murderers of Mack Charles Parker, though known, have never been indicted. No one has ever been charged by the State of Mississippi with the murder of three civil rights workers in 1964. The trials of persons charged with the murder of Lemuel A. Penn and of Jonathan Daniels resulted in acquittals. The measure of progress in this area, and our present lamentable situation, is indicated by the fact that a person was actually charged with the murder of Medgar Evers, and was brought to trial, resulting in a hung jury; he was retried, with the jury hung again. Here the prosecuting officers and the judge did their duty—all credit to them—but juries are a part of our system of administration of justice, too. The trial of one of the persons charged with the murder of Mrs. Viola G. Liuzzo likewise resulted in a hung jury. A retrial led to an acquittal.

Jurymen take an oath to administer justice fairly and impartially, according to the evidence produced before them in open court. Until they do so, can it be surprising that Negroes have little confidence in the administration of justice in southern courts? More than a century ago, in recounting the situation in the distant past, Chief Justice Taney said that "The Negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect." In these crucial matters—the physical safety of the Negro in his life and body, and his human dignity—how much progress have we made in the last three centuries, or alas, in the last hundred years?

Our sad lack of progress in the past 90 years is strikingly shown by the charge given by a Federal judge in Tennessee 90 years ago which is painfully applicable to our present situation:

"In no country but our own is the discreditable fact true that where murder and cruel shocking outrages are perpetrated by a dominant party in a narrow region of country, there is no power of punishment, save through the impractical instrumentality of those who have either committed or sympathized with the crime * * *. Unless our statesmen, State or National, create some jurisdiction of wider scope and which will authorize indictments and trial beyond the narrow limits a majority of whose citizens abet the crime to be punished, the Nation must still submit to the disgrace of yearly additions of mean and courage-wanting murders of the innocent and the helpless, without the slightest infliction of any legal penalty upon the offenders * * *. It has been our painful duty in repeated instances to charge juries that the Federal court had no cognizance of offenses where crimes so cruel and shocking have been proved that the court, jury, and audience could scarcely refrain from tears of sympathy, and where the elegantly dressed, socially well connected, and shameless murderers, had, in the communities where they had shed innocent blood, not only confessed but boasted of their crime and who had either not been indicted at all, or, when tried, had been acquitted by juries, their coadjutors in crime, amid the acclamation of their coconspirators * * *. It is believed by many of our best citizens that there should be here, as in every other government on earth, some power to bring such wicked men to justice, outside of, and uncontrolled by, the wills and hands which have united in their atrocities.[1]

So long as lawyers, public officials, and State courts in the South continue to distort the process of public power so that Negro citizens may not enjoy the legal equality promised them or exercise the liberties assured them by the Constitution, Federal authority must continue to make itself felt. A central irony in the situation in which the South now finds itself is the fact that the refusal of its lawyers and its judges to fulfill their plain responsibilities has been the principal cause of the intervention from outside against which the South so vigorously protests. So long as disregard of national law rules the southern scene, national power must make itself directly felt. Sometimes its bite will affect the electoral processes that have been misused to preserve discriminations. Sometimes injunctions will be issued to prevent continued harassment of Negroes. Sometimes cases that have been initiated for abusive purposes will be removed from the State courts where they are pending. The sooner the bar and the officials of the South recognize that this is one country and that the Constitution of the United Staes is law everywhere in the United States, the sooner they will find themselves partners in the enterprise of American government.

On all these matters, progress can be made in the long run only in the South and through southerners. That is as it should be, but there should be progress—great and heartening progress which will really make the Negro an equal in all the aspects of the administration of justice—the little homely, personal aspects which are so important, and in the impartial actions of all officials concerned—police, sheriffs, magistrates, as well as judges and jurors. This must not only be the fact, but the Negro must know it to be the fact and have confidence in it. Perhaps this is the millenium. But America, the land of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the land of liberty and the home of the free, cannot be content with less. Southern citizens, white and Negro, cannot wisely or in good conscience rest until these things are accomplished.

In all of this, lawyers have a special responsibility. They are persons trained in the law, with presumably a special interest in justice. They are officers of the courts. Through their training and background, they are often elected to our legislatures, hold executive and administrative offices, as well as sit on the benches in our courts. Yet, too many of the members of the bar—it is not too much to say most of the members of the bar in the South—have been complacent about these things. Some have been concerned, but have felt that they could not speak up, a sad commentary on the situation which so distorts the administration of justice where racial factors are involved.

In the hearings before the Commission, in which a number of lawyers of good will participated, it developed that there are only four Negro lawyers in Mississippi. Until just a few years ago, there was no place in Mississippi where a Negro could study law, and it is well known that the admission of Negroes to the University of Mississippi was accomplished only with the aid of military force. There are still no Negro graduates of the University of Mississippi Law School. There are no white lawyers in Mississippi who will ordinarily handle a civil rights case. Much the same is true in other States in the South. For this situation, the dominant groups in these Sates are responsible. The lawyers, there and elsewhere, bear a special responsibility.

In his address as President of the American Bar Association in August 1965, an able and public-spirited lawyer, Lewis F. Powell, Jr., spoke of the importance of safeguarding fair trial and of the "diminishing minority which still uses violence and intimidation to frustrate the legal rights of Negro citizens." He went on to urge that "the courts and legislative halls, rather than the streets, must be the places where differences are reconciled and individual rights ultimately protected." Appealing as this is, does it really get to the bottom of the problem? Are there any basic legal questions in this area which have not already been settled in the legislative halls or in the courts? The difficulties arise not because of doubts about the law—about schools, about voting, about public accommodations, about facilities in transportation, about juries, about employment—but because of persistent failure to accept and follow and apply and be governed by the clearly applicable law, and to administer the law fairly and without discrimination.

The Negro, and his supporters, march in the streets not because the law is not clear, but because it has not been followed. He knows from long experience that a resort to the courts will far too often result, initially, in delay, frustration, injustice, and denial of clearly defined rights. It is small comfort to him that 3 years later he will get justice from the Supreme Court of the United States. Justice—true and real justice—should be dispensed by voting registrars, sheriffs, the police, school boards, district attorneys, justices of the peace, and the others close at hand who represent the authority of the State, and who use their authority far too often to perpetuate a system of social control, which may represent what has been regarded as the southern way of life, but which is wholly inconsistent with rights established by valid Federal power as a part of "the supreme law of the land."

---

[1] Emmons, J., charge to the grand jury, case No. 18,260, 30 Fed. Cas. 1005, 1006–07 (C.C.W.D. Tenn. 1875).

Thus the key to the greatest domestic problem of this country may well be found in the administration of justice by southern peace officers and in southern courts. The problem is by no means exclusively a southern problem, but it is more deep-seated and more pervading there. Not until justice can truly be found close at home, from officers of the law and local magistrates, can it be rationally expected that Negroes in the South, and their supporters, will present their cause in the courts rather than in the streets. The sad fact is that the streets have long been the only place where they could ordinarily get any sort of an effective hearing. Of course these matters should be gotten off the streets; but this can only be done when the administration of justice is not so deeply polluted at the source.

The lesson which these hearings drive home to me is the crucial importance of doing what we can to change the atmosphere in southern courts and the approach of southern law enforcement officers. As Daniel Webster said in his funeral oration on Mr. Justice Story: "Justice, Sir, is the great interest of man on earth." And as Thomas Erskine said at the trial of Thomas Paine, "The choicest fruit that grows upon the tree of English liberty" is "security under the law; or, in other words, an impartial administration of justice."

When the ordinary southern Negro has confidence in his local peace officers and in his local courts, when the people of the whole country can have confidence in southern justice at the grassroots, then the Negro, and others interested in equal rights for all citizens, will surely present their grievances to the courts and stay off the streets.

This is the great challenge to the lawyers of this country, and particularly to the lawyers of the South. "The place of justice is a hallowed place," as Francis Bacon said long ago. There is no justice without true equality, not only in court but in all law enforcement procedures. Too long have we too casually accepted a system in this area which too often, sometimes even unconsciously and unintentionally, has in fact been grossly discriminatory. When southerners, and particularly southern lawyers, can accept and face this deplorable fact, and begin to work, openly and assiduously, to correct it, we can have real hope that this situation will change to the great benefit of the South and of the Nation.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Keys to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation conducted an essay contest recently on the subject of "Keys to Freedom." A number of the prize-winning essays by Wyoming authors were forwarded to me.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the essay by Mrs. Dick Masters, of Ranchester, Wyo., who won first place in the adult division. I ask that Mrs. Masters' essay be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keys to Freedom

While civilization exhausts itself in useless efforts to find the keys to freedom, it is tragic that the one simple, proven, effective formula is permitted to lay unheeded in the dusty unturned pages of American history. Frantic men are searching for new concepts and fresh approaches to achieve universal peace and prosperity. I feel America needs no new discoveries in the realm of political ideas or the launching of any new social experiments. Our need now is for rediscovery and renewed understanding of the true and tried principles of authentic Americanism. These are the keys to freedom.

Nearly 200 years ago thousands of Europeans came looking for a place where a common man could, God willing, become uncommon—where a man could become whatever his dreams, faith, energy, intellect, and manhood combined to make him, without a government to harness and retain him to a common level for the benefit of the general welfare. The promise of our country was freedom.

Freedom is not, however, free. People cannot—as most Americans glibly claim—inherit freedom. We can inherit a desire for freedom, we can inherit a social system built on the principles of freedom; but freedom must be won anew by every generation. Freedom is not an easy way of life but it is the only noble way for creatures made in the image of God.

The attitude toward freedom is shifting. Today, a whole generation of Americans have absorbed the notion that freedom means ease and comfort. Only in the 20th century have Americans begun to doubt and fear and lose their faith—lose the old confidence in the absolute rightness of American principles. Either they did not care or understand when leaders began to introduce wornout euphemisms of old-world collectivism into the American system.

Our Founding Fathers regarded patriotism—love of one's own country—as a basic key to freedom. They made it quite plain that the responsibility of the American Government was to the American people. The preamble of the Constitution says that this great document was ordained and established to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. We have persons in this country, who, knowingly or unknowingly, are trying to destroy these ideas.

Many persons in our country are against strong feelings of patriotism (which they call nationalism). They think it impossible for Americans to maintain their national independence as a free republic. They have completely lost faith in the central idea of the American Revolution; namely, that free men, under God, can manage their own affairs.

These same persons prefer government to be a big brother to care for us. The trouble here is that when Government has absolute power to promote the general welfare, the Government must also have the power to decide what the general welfare is.

The basis of this modern ideology is seemingly founded on the assumption that political power makes men wise. These powers presume the individual does not have integrity or good sense enough to provide for himself education, housing, or medica' care, preparation for his future or ability to run his own business.

One business of prime interest to me is agriculture. Controls were long ago introduced. Here is an example of the contradictions of this program. Millions of dollars are spent to put land out of production (to control the overabundance of food) and additional millions are spent to reclaim desert land and put it into production. Along with this gross contradiction, the Department of Agriculture has more employees than there are persons actually employed in all agricultural fields. Despite this fact, Government controls only a small amount of agriculture. The cost from taxes of these programs are prohibitive and wasteful. Leading agricultural organizations supported by farmers and ranchers throughout the Nation prefer to see these programs gradually concluded. Legislation now indicates we will have to fight against more controls which will ultimately mean more taxation for everyone.

No nation in history has survived a tax burden that reached a third of the national income. Our current welfare state has achieved this point. Because of our enormous debt the Government has adopted proportionate taxation. This progressive system was created by Karl Marx. Social legislation is now at its greatest peak. Our only return to freedom is by reduction of and economy in Government. We must restore the right of man to keep the fruit of his labors.

Taxation brought about by social legislation such as the new poverty program is not only draining our pocketbooks but thwarting personal freedoms. The old American constitutional system of freedom never did and never could eliminate poverty; but it produced greater material abundance for more people than any welfare state, planned economy, or communistic-socialistic-fascist system on record. The Founding Fathers provided for unbelievable prosperity of America when they gave us a workable means of preserving personal freedoms.

Probably the greatest problem facing our Nation is the dispute between the free world and communism. We are fighting Communists in Vietnam but are we really fighting communism? I believe our only defense against communism is to regain our free society by restoring individual freedom and our free economy—the keys to our freedom.

Now you and I must fight for the keys to freedom. You and I must answer again whether life is so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. If we are unwilling to pledge our lives, our efforts, and our sacred honor, then we must one day spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it was like in America when men were free.

James Russell Lowell, as Minister to England in 1875, was asked how long he thought our Republic would endure. He answered that our Republic would endure as long as the people kept the ideas of the men who founded it.

You and I hold the keys to freedom.

"We, the people * * *."

"Hey Peace Corps—You're a Real Guy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that much of the world's insecurity and unrest stems from misunderstanding. It is refreshing, therefore, to read an account by a former U.S. Peace Corps man in Ghana who tried, with some personal sacrifice, to close the understanding gap. He is Miles S. Pendleton, Jr., a 1961 magna cum laude graduate from Yale, who spent a year teaching English and French at the Ghana Secondary School, Koforidua, and another year teaching English and history at Adisader College, Cape Coast, Ghana. Mr. Pendleton, who was in the Andover class of 1959, has written a fascinating account of his experience in the Andover Bulletin, October 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his report at this point in the Record:

"Hey Peace Corps—You're a Real Guy"

(By Miles S. Pendleton, Jr.)

When Francis Broderick, 1930, the Peace Corps representative in Ghana, reads his morning newspaper, he is apt to feel that the United States is neither well understood nor fully appreciated in that West African nation. The Ghanaian Times may report that "Yankee imperialism has taken unto itself the job of protecting a misnamed 'free world' by which it means the enforcement upon the world's unwilling millions of a rotten capitalist social system." And he may be told rather unflatteringly that 'the Yankee gunrunning act has come to Ghana. The dopes and drunks who run the murder incorporation called CIA are after the blood of Osagyfo Dr. Kwame Nkrumah because he is the biggest thorn in their neocolonialist ambitions * * *." Broderick and his fellow Americans are frequently warned that "although the CIA agents and their Peace Corps subversionists have failed with the guns and bullets" and have had to resort to "treacherous rumors to create alarm and panic [sic] and to confuse and divide our people," they will not be forgiven. "The people of Ghana," states the newspaper, "will work firmly to destroy them at their base and have the courage to tell these Yankee rogues that this cannot be the country of bloodsuckers and gun-running cowboys." If the Government-controlled press is to be believed, the ugly American—the literary creation of another Andover graduate—is a well-known personage in Ghana.

Misunderstanding, however, is a two-way street. When Austin Ahanatu, a Nigerian who was a teaching assistant at the 1965 Andover summer session, reads the Boston papers, he may very well come to feel that his country is misunderstood by Americans. Part of the blame must fall on the shoulders of an Andover student who never quite graduated. Edgar Rice Burroughs imprinted the image of Tarzan and his friends on the American mind, and it is an image that has not been easy to erase. Thus, the Boston Globe thoughtlessly entitles an article "Why a Barefooted Nigerian Chief Loved Stevenson" even though the sandal-wearing chief is a graduate of Oxford, a respected lawyer, a former chief justice of his region, and is now an ambassador.

The United States and the emerging or developing nations of the world have much of value to share with each other. At the moment however, they seem to share more than anything else a sense of mutual misunderstanding. Through the impact of colonialism in its broadest sense, the developed nations have for centuries affected the ways of the underdeveloped areas of the world. Europe long felt little need to understand Asia, Africa, or Latin America, for it could force them to try to understand Europe. Today, despite our traditionally limited colonial entanglements, the United States is often considered by the "third world" to be the arch-example of a "European" nation. But no longer can we or anybody else force others to see us exactly as we would like to be seen.

Since the Second World War, more than half a hundred new nations have emerged from colonial obscurity onto the world scene. They can now demand that we try to understand them just as we want them to understand us. Individually they are weak, poor, self-conscious. Collectively, however, they are increasingly vigorous, powerful, and self-assured. They can affect the course of international life, and they know it. The majority of the world's population lives within their borders. They are storehouses and producers of raw materials which we badly need. They often seem strategically important. As a result, we have been prepared to play a growing role in their development as we have discovered how closely we are bound to them economically, politically, and strategically. Our commitment in Vietnam is an obvious example. The first American soldier killed in that country was a member of the class of 1956 at Andover.

During our early days as a Nation, the United States was like many of the newly independent countries of today. Like most of them, we were born of a revolution during which we threw off what we considered to be the yoke of colonialism. We were a polyglot nation and we were to become more so before attempting to become less so. Our efforts to overcome disunity evenutally led to a civil war. We had our alien and sedition acts. We turned our backs on "entangling alliances" and retreated into a pleasant sort of neutrality while we let the passage of time legitimize our new system of government. Washington, the charismatic father figure, served as a focus for our sense of national identity. As we pushed westward, our States supported the construction of canals and railroads and encouraged the founding of banks and businesses with what might seem today to be an almost socialist fervor.

Nevertheless, we easily forget our own history when we come to consider today's newly independent nations. Time snickers when a Ghanaian politician, perhaps seeking to help generate a sense of national identity in the land by elevating the status of its president, writes: "to us, his people, Kwame Nkrumah is our father, teacher, our brother, our friend, indeed our very lives, for without him we would no doubt have existed, but we would not have lived. * * *" In a somewhat similar vein President Ezra Stiles of Yale declared in a sermon in 1783: "O Washington, how I do love thy name. How have I often adored and blessed thy God, for creating and forming thee the great ornament of human kind." Attempts by the leaders of the new nations to develop political religions do not sit well with us. But those who saw the animated Lincoln at the World's Fair are familiar with his speech more than a century ago calling for a new political religion in what was then becoming a divided nation.

Despite such historical similarities, however, the gap between the United States and the countries which are underdeveloped is obviously an immense one, and it is this gap which helps to generate mutual misunderstandings. Perhaps the economic gap is most readily understood, although it is by no means the only one. More than two-thirds of the world's population lives in economically underdeveloped countries—countries where more than 60 percent of the workforce is engaged in agriculture. In these countries the average yearly per capita income is less than $100, whereas it is more than $2,500 in the United States. Only 1 in 10 earns $700 a year. Four out of five are illiterate, and the average life expectancy is only one-half of what it is in the United States.

Disease is a constant problem, but there are few doctors. In Ghana, for example, only 275 doctors attempt to care for 7 million potential patients while New York City, with about the same number of people, boasts 10 times that number of psychiatrists alone. The World Health Organization has estimated that close to 90 percent of the inhabitants of Ghana would require hospitalization if they were living in the United States.

Malnutrition plagues the people of developing nations. A recent report by a Presidential task force estimates that about 70 percent of children in the less-developed countries are either undernourished or malnourished. Our food-for-peace program has often meant the difference between life and death to starving peoples. However, not until August of this year did we begin to fortify with vitamins the nonfat dry milk we have been sending abroad through the program. Even now, we refuse to send dried fish flour which is rich in badly needed protein because a number of Senators find the substance repulsive even though it is medically pure.

Outside Timbuktu, I opened a can of tuna fish and was almost instantly surrounded by a group of children, their distended bellies crying malnutrition. When a sliver of fish accidentally fell from my fork into the dust, they dived after it and stuffed dirt into their mouths. Each child hoped that he had also captured the sliver of fish. That month the Reader's Digest carried an advertisement informing its American readers: "For 'chicken' we used pure savory chicken meat. In 'chicken and liver' we have a practically perfect paté. Then we made a wonderful, flavorful, bountiful gravy and ladled it lavishly over succulent morsels of meat. * * * Let your pet have a gourmet food for dinner tonight. * * * Puss 'n Boots, maker of America's No. 1 cat food."

Obviously, then, the economic gap between the United States and the developing nations is immense. Our 195 million people represent only 6 percent of the world's population, but we have 38 percent of its income. Europe, with 22 percent of the world's population, has another 36 percent of its income. Thus, 28 percent of the people on earth have access to almost three-quarters of the world's income, and the situation is not changing. In the United States we spend more money advertising liquor each year than the sum comprising the entire national budget of Ghana, the wealthiest nation on a per capita basis in tropical Africa.

The economic gap between the United States and the developing nations is obviously related to other gaps of a social, cultural, political, and ideological nature. We represent the modern and they the traditional because we have developed the skill and the resources to be modern in an industrial sense. We emphasize cleanliness and health to what is often considered to be an extreme partially because we can afford to do so. We share with some other nations Western man's concern for the individual in a world which is, more often than not, concerned with the mass. We are literate in a world of illiteracy, monodeistic in a world of many gods, strong in a world of the weak, and predominantly white in a world of color.

No wonder Aimé Cesaire, the apostle of Negritude, did not strike a sympathetic chord in the hearts of many of us when he wrote:

> Hurray for those who never invented anything; for those who never explored anything; for those who never conquered anything; hurray for joy; hurray for love; hurray for the pain of incarnate tears.

Cesaire was, however, addressing himself to the majority. Many, like Chief Remi Fani-Kayode, the Deputy Premier of Western Nigeria, see the United States as: "Rich, content, overfed, and determined to remain so at all costs * * * the Santa Claus of the white races * * * a great proponent of the dignity of all men. Yet with all this, the American people are the inveterate enemies of the black races of the world."

The strong national leader who snarls at the United States may be attempting to buy time for the legitimization of political power and the growth of a national consciousness in his own country. He is perhaps not unlike George Washington, who wrote in his Farewell Address: "With me * * * a predominant motive has been, to endeavor to gain time for our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes." The Washingtons of our age, whether named Nehru, Nasser, or Nkrumah, would no doubt sympathize with our first President's personal aims.

But progress without interruption often seems to them to require a strong one-party system controlling almost every facet of national existence. For better or worse, a new—and, to us, often unfamiliar—definition of democracy must be devised. We are apt to ask whether Sukarno's "guided democracy" is democratic in anything but name. Whatever it is, it is certainly guided.

Hand in hand with the new democracy goes an emphasis on a pragmatic brand of socialism. Most new nations have only a limited amount of indigenous capital. Few of them have many entrepreneurs. Many have leaders who have been impressed with the economic strides made by the "socialist countries." As a result, the state is usually prepared to step in. Increasingly, however, the leaders of the new nations have come to realize that the form of socialism cannot be doctrinaire. Most admit that President Dacko of the Central African Republic was right when he asserted:

"Our socialism will be empirical. As required by circumstances, by necessity, we will adapt, we will change, we will modify. We will not reject the imperative of facts, and we will strive to avoid the desperate experiences of certain other Africans. The state will recognize the private sector through which we shall naturally market our products."

Whether the brand of socialism is pragmatic or doctrinaire, however, it is not apt to appeal to Americans. The word leaves a bad taste in our mouths even if it means nothing more than social security. For the majority of people on this earth, the word "capitalism" has the same effect. Neutrality is a positive good to a leader of a new nation who can use it to attract economic aid from both East and West. To us, neutralism seems almost immoral. To many people in developing countries, the American way of life is a cancer they see manifested in the form of cultural imperialism. Our songs and dances, movies and books, threaten to undermine the traditional way. Their very popularity makes them a target for the wrath of nationalist leaders.

Thus, the economic gap between the developed and the developing nations is accompanied by social, cultural, political and ideological cleavages. Very likely, closing the economic gap through population control combined with increased economic, technical and educational assistance would help to span other voids. At the same time, increased understanding of each other through study and personal exchange of ideas, aims and values would no doubt help to overcome the emotional gaps. On the individual level, as many Andover graduates have discovered, much can be done and is being done. Despite what Francis Broderick reads in the Ghanaian Times, he knows that when he walks through town, a young apprentice tailor is apt to call out, "Hey, Peace Corps, you're a real guy"—the highest compliment a young Ghanaian can give a "cowboy imperialist."

First Jobs for Women's Job Corps Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on November 30 the Washington Post published an article headlined, "Job Corps Girls Start To Work." The story dealt with the hiring of the first two graduates of the Women's Job Corps program.

I am proud that it was a leader of industry from my own State who not only hired these young women but whose company was also the first to hire male Job Corps graduates. The man to whom I refer is W. C. Hobbs, senior vice president of Consolidated American Services, Inc., and chief executive of its management and engineering services division. Mr. Hobbs is a former resident of Elwood, Ind.

In the views which Mr. Hobbs has expressed there is sound advice for other potential employers of the Job Corps graduates. The Corps will be successful only as it is fruitful in opening the doors to jobs through training, and the keys to those jobs are held by men like Mr. Hobbs.

Mr. Hobbs in this article has expressed his confidence in the work of the Job Corps trainees. "I feel very strongly," he says, "that in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor. Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school does not mean they are not good workers.

"Once industry realizes they have a pool, and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps and say, 'I need so many of this type of skill.' "

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post may appear in the appendix to the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Job Corps Girls Start To Work

(By Elizabeth Shelton)

The first two career girls to come to the Capital with Job Corps diplomas as their credentials are happily at work in the downtown office of a management consultant firm.

Juana Marie Waquiu, a 21-year-old from Jemez Pueblo, N. Mex., arrived here yesterday to double as a PBX switchboard operator and receptionist with the management and engineering services division of Consolidated American Services, Inc. She was the first graduate of the Los Angeles Women's Job Corps Training Center.

The second graduate, Willye L. Evans, 20, of Oklahoma City, Okla., has been on duty in the same office for a week as a clerk-typist. "It's just like home," Willye says. "Everybody is so friendly."

Both live on Buchanan Street NE., with the family of a member of the MES staff.

Neither has had a chance yet to sightsee around the city, but Willye went on a motor trip in Maryland on Sunday and thought it "very nice."

Her mother is a domestic worker in Idabel, Okla. Willye tried working her way through Langston University in Oklahoma but had to leave in her second year, because her salary as an assistant to the advisor of the New Homemakers of America was applied only to tuition and left her no money for expenses or to send home.

She plans to go to business college at night with an eventual goal of teaching business subjects. She attended the metropolitan junior college in Los Angeles and graduated in 5 months.

Juana, daughter of a carpenter, attended Albuquerque Business College, in New Mexico, for a year, but couldn't find a job in that city. She learned switchboard operation at the Los Angeles Trade Technical College while enrolled at the Los Angeles Job Corps Center.

Back at home are five brothers and two sisters. The older sister is married and the oldest of her brothers helps his father, but the others are still of school age and Juana helps to support them.

The brandnew white collar girls make $2 an hour at their new jobs. They will receive in-grade promotions and the chance to rise, through training, to new grades.

W. C. Hobbs, senior vice president of Con-Am and executive chief of its MES division, is confident the Job Corps is producing a competent employment pool for industry.

The organization was the first to hire male Job Corps graduates as employees and found their work so satisfactory that two are being given additional pay and responsibilities. The third was assisted to return to high school so he will have a base for higher education.

One of the reasons that Hobbs feels so assured is that the 24-hour-a-day living experience at a Job Corps center gets everything about the enrollee's abilities and habits down on the record.

"This provides a great deal more information than a series of interviews, or even a job trial," he said.

"I feel very strongly that, in the Job Corps, industry has a natural young mine of flexibility and a pool of labor," he said. "Just because these are poor kids who have dropped out of school doesn't mean they are not good workers.

"Once industry realizes they have a pool and can direct the skills and technical training they need, they are going to come to Job Corps and say, 'I need so many of this type of skill.'

"This is one place where the Government is spending money that is an investment. The kids will put money back into the country."

The Late John Taber

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able, conscientious, and influential Members of this House when I first came to Congress was the late John Taber, of New York. He had a wonderful grasp of government and complete courage to vote his convictions.

When he retired in 1962, it was because he did not feel able to continue, physically and mentally, to carry out his responsibilities. This was a real loss to the House and to the country, but I felt he was right, because he knew he was unable to carry on as he had done when he was a younger man.

Personally, I learned a great deal from John Taber, but most of all, I admired his integrity. His courage and example will always be an inspiration to me. He was a truly great man and I and many others are better for having been associated with him.

Mr. Speaker, one thing I recall about John Taber was his human understanding and warmth under a gruff exterior. Another quality I remember about him was that when he knew he did not have the votes to prevail, he did not complain or capitulate. Instead, he made his argument and then accepted defeat in good humor.

Today, much of my viewpoint and many of the opinions I express are the result of listening to John Taber. He was no orator, but he had the figures and could forcefully defend his position. He was always highly respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

His collaboration and long friendship and association with the late Clarence Cannon, of Missouri, was widely known and served as a wholesome influence in maintaining good legislative procedure.

As it must to all of us, death came to John Taber. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us try to emulate his fine record on behalf of the Nation and fiscal understanding.

I was greatly distressed to read of his death, but his work was done—and well done—so, in spite of sorrow and a sense of loss, those of us who knew him, it seems to me, should emphasize how fortunate we were. For that, we are all thankful. John Taber is at rest and his problems are over; we are thankful for that, too.

Difficult Choices Confronting Our Government at the Outset of the New Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I had the privilege of hearing a challenging speech delivered at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Society in New York City on December 11, 1965, by Thomas E. Dewey, former Governor of New York and the Republican candidate for President of the United States in 1944 and 1948. Governor Dewey outlined some of the difficult choices confronting our Government at the outset of the new year in the face of our growing involvement in the Vietnam conflict. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Dewey's speech be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. DEWEY, FORMER GOVERNOR OF NEW YORK, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SOCIETY, AT THE WALDORF ASTORIA, DECEMBER 11, 1965

It is hard for me to realize that it was 26 years ago when I last had the great pleasure of appearing at the annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Society. On the other hand, in the light of my experience at that dinner, I am a little surprised to find myself back here again at all.

The truth is I was afraid to come back. Twenty-six years ago this month the society's gold medal was presented to a towering figure, the late Senator George Wharton Pepper. In honor of the occasion, Senator Pepper delivered an inspired speech reviewing all the frustrations of his life. I shall never forget it. Among other things, he described in detail how he had long aspired to be Secretary of the Interior but in those New Deal days Harold Ickes was Secretary of the Interior. Senator Pepper observed that under those circumstances he had abandoned his ambition because he now realized that in order to be Secretary of the Interior, he must share his interior with all the people of the country.

He spoke lovingly of his former aspirations to be Attorney General of the United States. But that aspiration, too, had withered away, he said, because in those bygone days you had to be a lawyer to be Attorney General of the United States.

So it went. One crashing wisecrack followed another for a full half hour and when he sat down everybody in the room was helpless with laughter and I may say ready to go home—or repair to the bar.

They faced an unhappy fate. Two minutes later, at 10 o'clock, we went on a national radio hookup and I was introduced, chained to a manuscript previously written and already released to the press. I was the most miserable prisoner in the room. Historians are still debating how long it took before people stopped laughing at Senator Pepper and started listening to me. My own opinion is that nobody listened to any of the first half of my speech. I still doubt whether many people listened to the second half.

So you see I come back to the Pennsylvania Society filled with fear and trepidation.

The world was at war 26 years ago and Pearl Harbor was less than 2 years away. We have since seen a costly victory, an uneasy peace and 20 years of cold war. We have engaged in a hot war in Korea. We are now fighting a war against the Communists in Vietnam while we defend ourselves at home in a war by the peace beatniks against their own government; we have a wordy war by the national administration against inflation while it wages a hot war against the Federal Reserve Board for really fighting inflation. All in all, life does not seem to have become simpler.

My own views on Vietnam are somewhat different from many others—perhaps because I have been there. When I first arrived in Saigon it was the only beleaguered capital in the world. The only practicable way to get there was by air. When we landed at the airport, I counted 18 gun emplacements and as we drove into Saigon our Ambassador said, "You will notice that the jungle is cut back far from the road. The reason is so the Communists nipers will have a poor chance of hitting us as we go along." And he added: "The landmines they plant every night are cleared in the morning before we go out to the airport."

That night a grenade was thrown four blocks away, in the center of Saigon, killing two soldiers. No lives were safe even in the capital of the nation.

In neighboring Cambodia they have different problems, including particularly his very eccentric Imperial Highness Norodom Sihanouk. He is the only King I know who resigned his office to run for Premier. That was the election in which the candidates for the parliament campaigned by selling ballots to the natives so they could have the privilege of voting.

In the course of that stop in Cambodia we flew up to Angkor Vat, which is still one of the wonders of the world. As we were walking through one of the great temples, four natives came up, all of them almost naked and carrying bows and arrows. I confess it was a relief to know that these local citizens were offering us the bows and arrows for sale. It took five people in four languages to conduct the negotiations.

In Malaya the British were desperately fighting a jungle war against the Chinese Comunist guerrillas—a sacrificial and difficult war much similar to our present conflict in Vietnam. The Governor, Sir Henry Gurney, and I drove out to jungle headquarters to visit troops whose morale, I may say, was not being undermined by street marchers in London. The troops were paying heavy penalties, too, and 3 weeks after I left, Sir Henry was assassinated while driving with his wife down the same road.

Indonesia was as confused as ever. In Jakarta, the capital, a Dutchman was shot on his front porch, one block from the American Embassy, the night before my visit.

You may be interested to know that the events I am describing occurred 14 years ago, in the summer of 1951. I have been back in the area since and things have changed, of course, some for the better, some for the worse. Indonesia may have been saved from Sukarno's Communist follies by its army. The British have won their war in the jungles of Malaya and that country is free and prospering today in spite of its federation problems with Singapore.

Now, is our involvement in South Vietnam the whole problem today? I wish it were. As you know, Vietnam, together with Cambodia and Laos, made up French Indochina. These are to some extent artifically created nations with borders winding vaguely through the jungles.

Vietnam alone is about three times the size of Pennsylvania; Cambodia is nearly twice the size of Pennsylvania and Loas is still larger. Among them they have a population of 40 million people, almost as many as in France.

The land is rich and under-populated. As Sihanouk said to me, "Anybody who wants land can go out in the jungle, clear 20 acres, sign, his name on the village register and he owns it. He pays no taxes and it will support him and his whole family and some more families too." The same is true in Vietnam.

So let's agree that we are not dealing with some insignificant piece of jungle land whose people are to be surrendered lightly into Communist slavery. And this, of course, is only a small part of the story. If you look at your map, you will see that long peninsula reaching down from the southern border of China. In addition to the former French colonies, it includes Thailand, with its ancient civilization and stout independence. It is four times as big as the State of New York, with nearly twice as many people. Then there is Burma, five times the size of the State of New York, as well as Malaya and Singapore.

These countries together have a population of more than a hundred million people, with rich land, half the tin of the world, half the rubber and huge reserves of oil.

Add to these the Republic of Indonesia, for which we are cherishing more hope today, with its 3,000 islands, 100 million people and incomparable mineral resources.

If you are willing to treat that part of the world as one which is ultimately likely to stand or fall together, then you must add Japan, with its hundred million people and Taiwan—yes, and the Philippines, too. There is no stopping place—there is no particular little country we can throw to the wolves to buy peace. Mr. Chamberlain tried that at Munich and very few are defending that action today.

We are facing a Communist, imperialist threat to an area richer in resources than all of free Europe and greater in population. Many of these Asian countries have a strong tradition of freedom and independence but if they are stolen away one by one, our West Coast will finally lie naked on a Communist ocean. Worse than that there will be few left anywhere with the courage to stand up against the imperialist conquerors.

The Communists abroad and their friends here in the United States tell us that all this is really none of our business. They say that all of these troubles around the world are really just wars of liberation conducted by the indigenous peoples themselves. They want us to relax and placidly watch their puppets seize control of the world bit by bit, all in the name of "national liberation". They insist that any non-Communist government is fair game for them and that only Communist governments are legitimate.

To all those who are tempted to accept these views I suggest that they read and reread Mr. Kosygin's savage interview this week. We are told he spoke in calm and pleasant tones as he expressed blind hatred for the United States and implacable hostility for the cause of freedom everywhere. It really should be crystal clear by now, even to the softest head, that the Soviet Union is determined to carry on its wars of subversion and conquest and is wholly dedicated to that end.

Our struggle for survival will be long and costly. Fortunately I believe our people know the nature of the danger and have the patience, the intelligence, and the character to win through.

As a people we know that freedom will not be defended nor gains made through the peddling of falsehoods on placards in the streets or the burning of draft cards.

On the other hand, we will not win through by relying on snap judgments and armchair strategies. So long as our Government is soberly facing up to world problems and relying on the best of political, diplomatic, and military opinion, we should support its conduct with calm wisdom and patriotism.

Above all my message to you is that we must learn patience. It took many centuries to win the liberties we enjoy. They are worth preserving, however, great the cost or long the struggle.

It would be easier to support the administration in these affairs if it were not itself waging war against important segments of our own society at home.

For several years now we have had a remarkable increase in productivity, a remarkable decrease in unemployment and relative stability of prices. This certainly gladdens the hearts of all of us and we would hope for its continuance.

Our free economic system has done pretty well for us over the centuries. It has done so much better than any other system anywhere anytime in history that we should cherish it, teach it in the schools and build it up.

The free market has carried our country to incredible heights. There is no limit to the future of the productivity of our country or the opportunities for our people. There is no ceiling we cannot reach.

We may now, however, be at a point when our power seems greater than it is. If so, this is a danger point.

Prices have begun to rise over a broad spectrum of the economy. As matters now stand they are likely to rise further and faster under the strains of the war in Vietnam and heavy deficit spending by the Government. It is not just one or two or three prices that are going up. They are rising across the board and every housewife and every purchasing agent knows it.

Our dilemma could be put in the form of a choice between continuing as we are, and going down a disastrous road of inflation or, on the other hand, heavily reducing our commitments to save the stability of the economy. I do not think either radical method is necessary.

Certainly we must continue supporting the war in Vietnam to the limit.

Certainly we want to implement the fine causes to which we have this year committed great new sums of money in the fields of education and scientific research and the efforts to reduce poverty and open the doors of opportunity to all of our people.

Certainly, too, we want to keep our essential commitments to all of our friends around the world both in the form of defense, military support, and economic aid.

Most of all we want to and we must maintain our economic strength for the long pull ahead. It seems to me that with good will on all sides and some belt tightening, we can achieve all of our objectives.

Right now, at this stage, we are trying to do too much in too many ways, too fast. Broadly rising prices in a free market indicate a rising temperature. It may or may not be overheated and the debate on that subject is still raging. But for sure you can't make it any colder by talking at it or by putting a piece of ice on the thermometer.

Now the administration says it is against inflation. When the price of aluminum went up a half cent they threatened to throw the stockpile on the market to stop it. The same occurred with copper and again with wheat. But when credit becomes short there is no stockpile of money to throw at the shortage—there is no stockpile—unless it be printing press money. Call it by any name you will, printing press money is inflation.

One of the time-tested steps to prevent inflation is a rising interest rate. The Federal Reserve Board has now raised the discount rate and I believe the people owe a debt of gratitude to the Board and its distinguished Chairman for their wisdom and courage.

This action will also be helpful to our balance of payments. Furthering this cause, the administration has enlarged its program to induce business to reduce its overseas investments on what is euphemistically called a voluntary basis. Despite some reservations as to the permanent validity of the program the leaders of business have accepted it wholeheartedly. Some people are going to get hurt but the Nation comes first, and we may hope the program is successful.

Even if it succeeds, we will still be in trouble. I suggest the time has come for a sterner review of our overseas commitments. Nothing can be stinted in Vietnam so we must look at other areas.

We are maintaining expensive military establishments around the world. For example, 20 years after the end of the war, we are still maintaining large Armed Forces in Europe. This was a hard issue in the late 1940's and I fought vigorously in favor of it when it was proposed by President Truman. Times have changed, however. Europe is fully rebuilt and more prosperous than ever. At a time when we have heavy commitments elsewhere, it may well be time to reduce sharply this expensive program and I believe expert opinion will agree.

The Marshall plan was a tremendous success and accomplished its purpose in restoring Europe after the war. Our comparable programs among the developing countries are quite different and I think the time has come to take a very, very hard look at them in the light of our present necessities.

Surely no one would seriously contend that all of our aid around the world has been well spent. Loans and gifts to governments for the construction of new plants where there is no skill or capacity to operate the plants or market the goods have not been notably successful.

On the other hand, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have been successful.

Perhaps the most useful aid of all has been in the areas where American free enterprise built facilities in cooperation with people of the developing countries.

When government money is involved there is a strong human tendency to find ways to spend it, whether the project is good or bad. If it is private money there is a strong tendency to make it go to work effectively to produce goods and services and to build a capitalist system which will support a free country. I think it is time that our foreign economic aid be substantially reduced and be redirected to the development of private enterprise.

There is more to be done. Many domestic programs started this year call for greatly increased expenditures in the next fiscal year. It seems to me that these commitments require this same hard look we are applying elsewhere and perhaps we might in the process get time to learn better how to manage some of the new programs.

Under these circumstances we can support the war in Vietnam and achieve, as we must, both a better balance in our international payments and in our national budget. This will also be good for the economy because it will be growing soundly with a sound currency.

The amount of artificial stimulants a society can take without damage is a bit like the degree to which an individual can take artificial stimulants without damage. There is a limit and it is well to know where it is. I believe we have reached that limit in our country today and we should take care to recover our balance.

In times of stress, it is well for each of us to respect the opinions of others and I hope I have done so tonight. We are all in the same boat together—a prosperous boat which is carrying the hopes of all freemen in a perilous sea. Let us hope that we will all have the patience and the courage to pull our share at the oars for so long as we are spared to do so.

Pittsburgh's War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh has benefited substantially from the antipoverty program. But much remains to be done. As I have indicated in previous statements to the House, our program in Pittsburgh might well be studied as a pattern for other cities of comparable size.

The distinguished mayor of our city, Mr. Joseph M. Barr, has written the President a letter outlining some of the significant achievements this past year of the Pittsburgh program and urging not only that funds for the national antipoverty effort be maintained, but that they should be increased if the war on poverty is to be won.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mayor Barr's letter at this point in the RECORD.

CITY OF PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 5, 1966.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: During the past few months, the economic opportunity program (the war on poverty) has come under fire for various reasons.

Such criticism, it seems to me, is perhaps inevitable in a large-scale program as creative and innovative as the war on poverty.

What is disturbing are the accompanying rumors that funds for the Economic Opportunity Act will be cut back at a time when this Nation should be strengthening and expanding this bold new effort to stamp out poverty.

Such rumors are baseless, I am sure, for I know of your own personal commitment and that of your administration to this program which has sparked new hope in so many homes and hearts across the country.

My purpose in writing to you at this time is to offer a capsule report of what the antipoverty effort has made possible in one community, Pittsburgh, in little more than a year. For it was in November 1964 that the Pittsburgh community-action program was approved and funded for the first time. As a result, we now have the following activities underway, activities that did not exist prior to the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Some 30,000 children from disadvantaged homes, ranging from preschool age to high school age, are now participating in special compensatory education programs that include preschool classes, reading clinics, tutorial programs, and special classes for the mentally retarded and emotionally disturbed.

Employment centers have been established in eight city neighborhoods, providing opportunities for employment, manpower retraining courses, the Job Corps, and other training programs in the disadvantaged communities that need these services most. More than 500 persons have found jobs through these neighborhood centers.

More than 400 persons previously unemployed have been trained and employed as subprofessionals in their own neighborhoods by the community agencies providing services there. Their employability provides visible hope for the families and children with whom they work.

Several thousand Pittsburgh families are receiving a range of comprehensive health and family services including training in child care and home management.

More than 200 young men and women have been placed in the National Job Corps from Pittsburgh.

Legal aid services are available for hundreds of families and individuals who up to now could not afford professional guidance.

Literally hundreds of Pittsburgh citizens in poverty areas are participating in the decisionmaking that directly affects their lives and their community's well-being. They are learning that their views do count, that they can help plan and evaluate every service offered under the aegis of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Through the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we are providing employment for nearly 3,000 young people between the ages of 16 and 21, helping them learn new skills, perform necessary jobs that otherwise would not be done in the community. For many of these youngsters, this is their first job, their first chance at economic independence.

Occasionally, a few of these youngsters will get into trouble. But the encouraging part of our experience is that the vast numbers of them don't; they are responding to supervision and counseling far better than we anticipated.

For example, in the city's own young corps section, more than 125 youngsters out of 600 were persuaded to resume their schooling in the evenings in order to earn a high school degree.

I am convinced that thousands of young men and women throughout the country stayed off the streets and out of trouble in 1965 because of the job opportunities provided by the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Nearly 1,200 preschool children, ages 4 and 5, from slum areas participated in Project Headstart last summer. Each child received a medical and dental examination, many for the first time; each child was exposed to special educational programs to help overcome the disadvantages of an impoverished background.

These are some of the highlights of Pittsburgh's experience under the Economic Opportunity Act. This program has touched the lives of nearly 50,000 of our citizens for the better.

I do not mean to suggest there is any magic formula involved or anything unique in the Pittsburgh experience. I am sure that the antipoverty program has made as good an impact or greater in hundreds of other communities.

We, in Pittsburgh, got off to a good start in this program because of advance community planning.

We have kept this program scrupulously nonpolitical. I consider this a must if essential programs like the war on poverty are not to fonder on the shoals of partisan bickering.

But beyond this, what is required to make the antipoverty effort work is a deep discontent with the eixstence of poverty in our midst and a strong commitment to do something about it.

There have been occasions when we encountered administrative difficulties at the local and Federal level—and we probably will encounter still more. This is to be expected. At the same time, we are encouraged by the unstinting cooperation we have received from the OEO staff in Washington, their competence, their enthusiasm, their availability at virtually any hour of the day.

In my judgment, the war on poverty is the one program which can ultimately help achieve the goal of equality for all our citizens in terms of better education, improved health and welfare services and increased training and job opportunities.

In summary, we are encouraged by the results of 14 months of operation in the Pittsburgh war on poverty. But we are committed for the duration. To break the poverty cycle which has entrapped thousands of Americans for generations is no short-term venture. Such a commitment, in turn, will require a greater outlay of funds than anything that has yet been proposed.

Pittsburgh is one community that regards the war on poverty as one that must be waged vigorously—and the Economic Opportunity Act is the arsenal from which we draw our weapons for this struggle.

This arsenal must now be expended to enable more and more communities to give their less fortunate citizens a second chance for a better life and a better future.

We, in Pittsburgh, are grateful to your administration for having brought new hope into the lives of millions of Americans who are not sharing in the overall prosperity of this richest nation on earth.

We are hopeful the Economic Opportunity Act will be strengthened and expanded in the new Federal budget for the major effort that still remains before us.

Very truly yours,

Joseph M. Barr,
Mayor, President, Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc.

Wisconsin's Great Record in Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Wisconsin has long been a leader in providing vocational training as well as the more formal classroom education for its young people. In fact, Wisconsin was the first State—more than 50 years ago—to establish such a program.

This leadership in an area so vital to the future of our Nation is clearly stated in a remarkable advertisement of the Marshall and Ilsley Bank in the Milwaukee Sentinel.

It points out that nearly every Wisconsin community with 5,000 or more persons has a vocational, technical, and adult education program. Smaller communities are served by traveling instructors.

This outstanding program is a tribute to the cooperative efforts of more than 2,300 local business, industrial, and labor leaders working with their community officials to provide an efficient and productive labor force.

This—in my judgment—is a prime reason why Wisconsin, in spite of many difficulties and vicissitudes, has been able to reduce its unemployment rate well below the national average.

I ask unanimous consent that the advertisement to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Nov. 16, 1965]

WHY IT'S EASIER TO CLIMB THE ECONOMIC LADDER IN WISCONSIN

By taking part in Wisconsin's top-rated vocational, technical and adult education, our citizens can start at the skilled worker level and advance rapidly. No State has a better system. Although a relatively high percentage of Wisconsin students go on to college, there is an abundance of opportunity for those with special training and skills. Wisconsin was the first State in the Union to establish an independent vocational, technical and adult education program. After more than a half century of experience, Wisconsin is recognized internationally as a leader in vocational training.

Nearly every community of 5,000 or more population is now included in the program. Traveling instructors serve areas where local needs do not justify a full-time teacher. More than 2,300 local business, industrial and labor leaders work with 400 advisory committees to keep training up to date and geared to specific needs. In proportion of population enrolled in vocational programs, Wisconsin is 35 percent higher than U.S. average. Enrollment in vocational and adult programs reached 177,000 in 1963–64. About 15,500 were enrolled in full-time post high school programs. Writing in Harper's magazine, Edward T. Chase, consultant on public affairs, states: "Milwaukee, which puts more money into vocational education than any other city its size, has a model system."

In another area of job training, more than 7,000 State firemen, from industry as well as public departments, participate annually in a firemanship training program which has a favorable effect on Wisconsin fire insurance rates. Training on improved safety practices on the job, in the home, on the road and in recreation reduces industrial liability costs and decreases job absences from injury. A deep and constantly-renewable pool of skilled workers is only one reason why industries are turning to Wisconsin as a place to do business. They like it here.

The Tetons of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before any business except a notice of the President's state of the Union address, had been transacted by this body, my fine neighbor, the able and matchless gentleman from Colorado, Byron Rogers, called before the House a joint resolution which was immediately considered and agreed. It called for National Ski Week in recognition of the recreational, economic, and healthful aspects of this truly matchless sport. I am happy to join him and other colleagues in inviting the people of the United States to observe this week by participation in the appropriate ceremonies and activities. More particularly, I call to their attention the growth of an area in Wyoming matched only by Sun Valley and Aspen in the magnitude of its runs, the distance of its vertical descent, and the complete grandeur and indescribable beauty of its creation.

I refer to the new Teton Village now being completed at Jackson Hole—the result of 4 years of labor of my friends Alex Morley, Jr., and Paul McCollister.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of personal emotion that I bring these comments to the floor of the House, for were I not in Congress today I believe that the course I would have taken would have led me to be the third man in the development of this great area for Wyoming.

I am happy to call to the attention of my colleagues the lead article of the world's largest ski magazine, Ski, for January 1966, an excellent article by Bill Tanler, and take this opportunity to invite all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who ski to ski Jackson Hole, and particularly to know the joy of being able to see the Tetons and to ski them in one grand and matchless experience.

The article follows:

BIG AND NEW ON THE ALPINE FRONTIER—JACKSON HOLE AIMS TO OPEN 4,135 VERTICAL FEET OF SKIING AND A HEADY MIXTURE OF FRONTIER WEST AND EUROPEAN ALPINE

(By Bill Tanler)

When the Austrian ski team appeared in the Rockies last spring for a series of international races, instead of native green or gray Tyrolian hats, the official team headdress was the traditional white and Western 10-gallon hat. It was on that same gallop through the western United States that Austrian coach and head cowboy Pepi Stiegler was offered and turned down the job of ski school director at a promising new ski resort that had yet to open. But in the fall, Stiegler made another swing through the West, reconsidered, accepted the job and swapped a home in Lienz for a bunk in one of America's picture postcard frontier towns, Jackson, Wyo.

The addition of a gold medalist to the Jackson Hole Ski Corp. staff further enhances the resort as the most exciting new ski area to open in the West since Vail. Stiegler, best remembered as the Austrian who edged Bill Kidd and Jimmy Heuga in the slalom at Innsbruck, also adds to that curious blending of European Alpine and American West, a kind of mixed atmosphere that encourages Austrian competitors to seek out cowboy hats and wear them.

Despite a functional alpine style of architecture being adopted for Teton Village at the foot of the area's tram (pitched roofs with big overhangs and multistory buildings), the flavor is likely to remain frontier western under the influences of nearby Jackson, an easy 12-mile drive from the ski area.

The town of Jackson itself sits very much alone in the northwest corner of the State. It is bordered by the Teton Range to the west and the 13,766-foot Grand stands just to the north of the ski development. Directly to the north are famous Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. To the south and east are great gaps of Wyoming countryside, rolling brown hills, high plateaus, the Wind River Range, and very little else.

In spite of its relative isolation, approximately 2 million visitors funnel through Jackson every summer, most of them on their way to or returning from a visit to Old Faithful, the Paint Pots, or any one of a hundred natural surprises to be found in the national parks. This surplus of summer traffic has created accommodations for about 4,000 in the Jackson Hole country and the bountiful number of places to stay can only work to the advantage of the wintertime skier.

The appeal of the western atmosphere is undeniable. The scenery has been seen, at least subconsciously, by millions of moviegoers. "Shane," "The Big Sky," and a dozen other movies have unraveled their western plots with the Grand Tetons as a backdrop. But in looking at the region from the skier's point of view, the key, of course, is the mountain itself, a forbidding looking collection of cuts and rocks faces that surprising enough opens up for the skier int a variety of bowls, wide slopes, natural draws and glades. The reason for the deceptive appearance of the mountain from the valley floor is simply its size. It is a 2½-mile trip from the valley floor to Rendezvous Peak, a vertical rise of 4,135 feet; the 63-passenger cabins of the Jackson Hole tram will make the trip in about 8 minutes. Moreover, the resort's little mountain, without its bigger brother, would be considered a major area in its own right; its two chairlifts in tandem, provide 2,100 vertical feet of skiing.

Although the size of the Jackson Hole area has an appeal for the better skier, much of the best terrain is no more than intermediate, and even the beginner will find plenty of room on easy slopes. A 2,300-foot double chairlift, the area's third chair, serves a slope with only a 334-foot vertical cut out of timber near the bottom of the area. This is the teaching slope and beginners' area.

For this first season, there are three lodges open in Teton Village, the Seven Levels, Alpenhof and Sojourner, plus about half a dozen private lodges completed on lots sold by the ski corporation. The Seven Levels houses a bar and rathskeller, restaurant, and ski shop. There is also a restaurant in the Alpenhof and a cafeteria in the Valley Station of the tram, a building that also contains ski patrol facilities and the business offices.

Considering its relative remoteness, getting to Jackson is not necessarily complicated, but if you drive, be prepared to spend some time on the road. Salt Lake City, for example, the nearest major city, is 265 miles to the south. Reaching Jackson by air is another story. Frontier Airlines has regularly scheduled flights into Jackson every day from Salt Lake City and Billings, Mont. Additional service has been planned directly from Denver. Right now the drive from the airport to the ski area is approximately 16 miles, but if the State proceeds with plans to build a new bridge across the Snake River, the airport will only be 4 miles from Teton Village. Eventually the airport is expected to be enlarged to give it the capacity to handle full-sized jets, a particularly popular idea for clubs and groups considering charter flights to Jackson. Indeed, Jackson Hole is the first major ski resort in the world to rely on air transport as the prime means of bringing in skiers.

Even if you accept the charm of its western setting as a major asset, the Jackson Hole ski area built up a remarkable record of acceptance before the first lift had been put into service. As a starter, the area was chosen as the site for this year's U.S. ski team Christmas training camp. And then the ski movie crowd taking in the current John Jay, Warren Miller, or Dick Barrymore films, was exposed to considerable Jackson Hole footage. The principal coup, however, was the acceptance by the U.S. Ski Association of Jackson Hole as its nominee as the site of the 1970 FIS world ski championships. Although inherent qualities of the ski development were partly responsible for the early interest in Jackson Hole, much of the action was generated by a migrant California businessman, Paul McCollister, who fell in love with the Jackson Hole country, bought a home and became a permanent resident. McCollister, the ski corporation president, used the touch of a Pied Piper to coax a steady stream of visitors into Jackson for a firsthand look at the big mountain.

McCollister turned up regularly at ski meets, ski meetings and anywhere else skiers and ski officials were likely to gather, including the FIS meeting last June in Mamaia, Rumania, to explain away the fact that the ski area had missed its original opening date by a full year and to spin tales of the wonders of Jackson Hole. Although it has never been widely publicized, McCollister had succeeded in reaching an agreement to have Bud Werner become ski school director following Werner's last appearance in the Olympics in 1964. Werner's death in the Swiss avalanche shortly after the Innsbruck games also broke up a reunion at Jackson with Werner's lifelong friend and coach, Gordy Wren, now area manager at Jackson Hole.

It is true that much of the enthusiasm for the new ski resort comes from the very size of the area, but skiing certainly isn't new in Jackson. The Snow King area, located just 6 blocks from the town's main street, has been in operation for 25 years and twice has been the site of the national junior championships. Snow King's chairlift was built in 1948. With a vertical of 1,700 feet, the area offers challenging skiing by anyone's definition. But eyes are on the big hill now, and it's possible that at the next FIS meeting in 1967, Jackson Hole will outbid the Swiss, Austrians, Japanese, Italians, and Germans to bring the world championships to Wyoming. There is already strong evidence to prove that the frontier image of the American West is most appealing to the rest of the world.

Free Enterprise Association Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, last month in New York City, the Free Enterprise Awards Association headquartered at 507 Fifth Avenue, New York City, held its annual awards ceremonies in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. Among those selected among the top 10 business success stories in America was 1 of South Dakota's distinguished citizens—Paul C. Green, president of the Hub City Iron Co., of Aberdeen, S. Dak. He richly deserves this recognition.

I ask at this point in my remarks to have reprinted a news story of December 21, 1965, reporting this inspiring event and following that a brief historical report of the steady steps toward success achieved by South Dakota's Paul Green.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE ENTERPRISE AWARDS ASSOCIATION PRESENTS THEM—RECIPIENTS COME FROM ALL OVER UNITED STATES TO CREDIT, PRAISE AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

NEW YORK CITY.—The 14th annual American Success Story Awards were presented today to 10 men "who symbolize the success possible to all under America's free enterprise democracy."

The recipients came from all over the United States to praise and credit the American way of life for making success possible.

Talbot T. Speer, who rose to own America's oldest paper, the 233-year-old Maryland Gazette, a newspaper chain, and Baltimore Business Forms, Inc., was the FEAA's awards chairman for the Waldorf-Astoria ceremonies.

The awardees were cited for their contributions to the economic growth of their communities, to their industries and for their dedicated work in civil, religious and philanthropic causes.

Speer has urged editors, government leaders and Americans in all fields to "get on a soapbox to counteract the Communist-organized anti-American demonstrations staged to subvert our people to communism and disloyalty."

He said that despite years of Red propaganda, Americans—free to vote any "ism"—have always chosen Americanism. He warned, however, that our Nation's life "is at stake in these days of crisis and I urge all Americans to cherish, champion and defend our democracy which allows private enterprise, religious freedom and the highest standard of living."

The Free Enterprise Awards Association, Inc., was chartered in 1952. With leaders in all fields it carries out its charter duties, "* * * to promote incentive and champion the cause of the American democratic system to bolster the faith of all people in the American way of life."

The recipients, selected from various U.S. trades and areas to show the opportunities and success possible in all parts of the United States were:

James S. Hunt, 67, of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., founder, president and chairman of Coral Ridge Properties, Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Kenneth S. Kelleher, 42, of Alexandria, Va., president and founder of Keltec Industries, Inc., of Alexandria.

Ted C. Wetterau, Sr., 76, of Frontenac, Mo., chairman of Wetterau Foods, Inc. of Hazelwood, Mo.

Everette E. Ballard, 64, of Park Ridge, Ill., president of All American Life & Casualty Co. of Park Ridge.

Harry C. Gravely, 47, of Martinsville, Va., president of the Gravely Furniture Co.

Morris B. Beschloss, 36, of Flossmoor, Ill., president of the Hammond Valve Corp., Hammond, Ind.

Robert F. Hayes, 61, of Nashville, Tenn., president, chairman of the board, and founder of the Hayes Garment Co. of Nashville, Tenn.

James W. Sikes, 36, of Lakeland, Fla., president and founder of Florida Tile Industries, Inc.

George Perrin, 38, of Fort Smith, Ark., president and founder of the Plastics Research & Development Corp., of Fort Smith, Ark.

Paul C. Green, 67, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., president of the Hub City Iron Co., the Hub City Iron Store of Aberdeen.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before reading into the Record the historical sketch of Paul Green's achievements, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial of which I strongly approve appearing in the Evening Capital newspaper of Annapolis, Md.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

AWARDS PROVE FREEDOM'S VALUES

Congratulations to the 10 men whose outstanding records of business and civic service have won them today's richly-deserved American Success Story Awards.

Their stories are outstanding examples of what can be achieved under democracy, where freedom of choice and ability, based on the foundation of a belief in God and in the dignity of man prevails.

They did not have to function under a system that places itself above the dignity of man as an individual, or have to please party agents or leaders, to obtain success.

Russia's leaders would do well to take a lesson from this and give it deep thought. It would give them a better understanding of the democratic system, which they criticize and try to tear down, and also of the power and strength of the United States and other free people.

The Free Enterprise Awards Association deserves high praise for pointing out to the world the proof of the value of our free enterprise system.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in conclusion, I now call attention to the success story of Paul Green, of Aberdeen, S. Dak.

There being no objection, the historical sketch of Paul C. Green was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Paul C. Green, 67 (Residence: 1741 South Main Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.); president, Hub City Iron Co., Hub City Iron Store, Aberdeen, S. Dak., director, Aberdeen National Bank.

To be a recipient of the Free Enterprise Awards Association's 14th Annual 1965 American Success Story Awards as an example of the success possible under America's free enterprise democracy.

Was raised in poor pioneer area. Starting at age 12 learned business from ground up in father's small machine shop while finishing high school. Had odd jobs. Was radio operator on *North Sea* minesweeper World War I. Was National Guardsman and in Officers Reserve Corps. Took mail course in business administration. Risked meager savings and took over father's debt-ridden machine shop during 1932 depression.

Starting with 13 employees and after years of hard work, long hours, and many obstacles he built Hub City Iron Co., into one of Aberdeen's largest industries and worldwide leadership with a 12-building complex of 200,000 square feet. He trained and employed hundreds of craftsmen, installed modern machine tools, a gray iron foundry, and developed and patented many diversified engine and farm implement products.

Today Hub City Iron Co. makes (with stocks for immediate delivery) millions of precision made gear boxes, engine valve guides, valve seat inserts, cylinder sleeves and other engine parts, and shop equipment for all automobile, truck, tractor, and industrial engines and machinery. Hub City is also a world leader in agricultural implement parts, power transmission units, spline shaft adapters and reducers and safeguard safety shielding assemblies. Hub also custom casts and machines parts for all industries and is now enlarging foundry for 50 percent more capacity.

Hundreds of distributors sell and service its products throughout the United States, Canada, Mexico, and the free world with over $5 million in sales to small and major manufactures of all types of machinery and to Army, Navy, and Air Force. His Hub City Iron Store is a wholesaler of automotive, truck, tractor, and farm implement replacement parts, shop equipment and supplies, plus general machine shop service and welding. P. C. Green works for many civic causes. He is executive reservist in the general industrial equipment and components division of the commerce department, director of Dakota Wesleyan University, board president of Aberdeen YMCA and has served on its international committees and national council. Cited for his vital contributions to his field, to American industry and our national defense.

A Tribute to Herbert Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, for more than 10 years it was my good fortune to serve on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, while Herb Bonner was the chairman. During this time, I learned firsthand that Herb was a man of the highest integrity, dedicated to the welfare of all matters coming under his committee jurisdiction.

For a number of years, my wife and I lived right across the hall from the Herbert Bonners in an apartment house. It was during this time that I first learned to know Herb and to realize that, modest and quiet though he was, he had a wide knowledge and keen understanding of the problems confronting the maritime and fishing industries. Especially, I discovered the patient care he always gave to his committee responsibilities.

So it is that my association with him—now, unhappily, terminated—has left warm memories as well as deep respect and admiration.

It was a real honor to serve under Herbert Bonner, and I shall never cease to cherish this experience.

To his wife, who was so dear to him and always his close companion, my wife and I extend our most profound sympathy. We share her sorrow. The memory of her husband's fine character and wonderful record is something that Mrs. Bonner will retain along with the devotion of her husband's friends, and we hope these blessings will always bring her comfort and satisfaction.

Award To Honor Memory of Lieutenant Hauschildt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following news item from the December 10, 1965, issue of the Hydeparker, the paper of the Hyde Park High School in Chicago:

ROTC TO GRANT HAUSCHILDT AWARD TO BEST HYDE PARK CADET

Each year one Hyde Park ROTC cadet will be chosen to receive the John C. Hauschildt Award. This award is being made by the Hyde Park High School Junior ROTC Cadet Corps to honor the memory of 1st Lt. John C. Hauschildt, USAF. Lieutenant Hauschildt, the first Hyde Park alumnus to die in the Vietnam war, was killed in action when his plane exploded after being struck by enemy gunfire. At the time he was making his third pass over a target about 200 miles north of Saigon.

During his high school years at Hyde Park, Lieutenant Hauschildt, a member of ROTC, yearned to become a pilot. He continually worked at building model planes and battleships.

After high school he attended the University of Illinois for a short time before joining the Air Force. Within a year, he earned an appointment to the Air Force Academy, from which he graduated 19th in a class of 500.

The winner of the Hauschildt Award will be chosen by a committee consisting of the military instructors, the assistant principal for administration and the chairman of the guidance department.

The winner of this award must be a junior or senior; must have no school record of disciplinary insubordination; must be eligible for the ROTC Neatness Ribbon Bar; must have earned the ROTC Extra Duty Ribbon Bar during the current school year; must have an average of "C" or higher in major subjects; must have an average of "B" or higher in ROTC.

The winner will have his name engraved on a permanent trophy donated by the Hyde Park ROTC and will be given a silver medallion presented by the Hauschildt family.

Henry W. Morrow, Able West Virginia Journalist, Calls for Thoughtful Participation of All Citizens in Developing Public Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I had the pleasure recently of reading a column by Henry W. Morrow, an able newspaperman and associate editor of the Spirit of Jefferson Advocate of Charles Town, W. Va. It is a thought-provoking article on the complacent thinking in our American society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spirit of Jefferson Advocate, Jan. 6, 1966]

HARDLY WORTH MENTION

SOMETHING FOR 1966

One of the most powerful forces in the world today, particularly in a free country, is public opinion. It prompts governments to act in one field and deters them in another. It provides more checks and balances than the Constitution ever dreamed of. And yet I shudder to think of how careless we are in forming it, collectively and individually. What better way to begin 1966 than to resolve to do something about the shoddy processes which characterize the way most of us go about forming—and expressing—an opinion? A few years ago an enterprising printer made himself quite a bit of money by printing small placards which were laughingly sold to thousands of executives across the Nation. The card said simply, "My mind is made up. Don't confuse me with the facts."

Everybody laughed, scarcely stopping to realize the ironical truth: that most of us do make up our minds prematurely, so to speak, and are loath to change them once they are made up, regardless of the facts. The "loath to change" may come about as a result of blind prejudice (which is probably as bad, if not actually worse, than an ill-founded opinion), or it may come about as a result of simple vanity and pride, born of an unwillingness to admit we were wrong.

The best insurance against getting "caught with our opinions down" is to be reasonably sure we have all the available facts before we form and express them. Opinions, by their very nature, are never either right or wrong. But facts exist or they do not exist. There is no better way of shaking an opinion to its very roots than by showing it to be predicated on a false foundation; i.e., nonexistent facts. Few things can make us look more silly than forming opinions on the basis of erroneous or distorted information. Another favorite pastime is that of forming opinions without hearing both sides of a given proposition. Still another pitfall is the tendency to form opinions on the basis of hearsay evidence. Hearsay evidence is generally nothing more than gossip. We should also carefully scrutinize our own opinions and those of others when they are formed or expressed in sweeping generalizations. Many a good idea has been consigned to the trash heap simply because someone said it was socialistic or communistic. Labels of this sort are sometimes warranted. But usually they are employed by minds too incompetent to think things through, and give a judgment on the package instead of on the label on the package. Two of the favorite whipping boys in this country today are big Government and the Supreme Court. What the Government does in Washington and what the Supreme Court decides in Washington should, in the very nature of things, be subjected to the most searching inquiry and analysis. But there is not place in the thinking man's wardrobe for categorized condemnation—condemnation that is based on labels instead of being based on what's in the package.

At the present time we have a President in the White House making round-the-clock decisions that, in one way or another, affect each and every one of us. It is reliably reported that many of those decisions are made on the basis of consensus of public opinion. I am not altogether sure by any means that this is a good way to make decisions; but if this is so, as I am reasonably sure it is, it behooves each of us to be a whole lot more careful than we have hitherto been in arriving at our own opinions, all of which go to make up the national consensus. It is bad enough to be brand conscious about the nationally advertised products we use in everyday life, and in this field we sit docily by and let Madison Avenue techniques determine what we eat, what we drink, and what we wear. But when we let the Madison Avenue technique tell us what to think, when we permit the merit of an opinion to be weighted and determined not by our own testing but by someone else's, we are in trouble. Reasoning from the authority of books, from the opinions of others, is not knowledge. It is faith. And when it comes to public opinion, I, for one, prefer not to be a blind, little sheep, following the leader, with a secondhand cart full of secondhand opinions, and with none of my own fashioning to sell or display.

If, by some magic mystery, I could have three wishes for 1966 they would be: That people would think; that people would think; that people would think. Here is the key to truth that will ultimately set us free.

Sheridan Junior College Supports American Effort in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, on this opening day of Congress with the specter of the continuing war in Vietnam ever present in the Senate and the House, I think it fitting that the RECORD of the first day's deliberations carry the very brief but eloquent statement in support of our war effort issued by 105 students of the junior college at Sheridan, Wyo.

I ask that the petition and the names of the signers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as one more bit of evidence that those irresponsible students who would send food and fiber to our Nation's enemies and work actively against our efforts to aid South Vietnam in repelling aggression are a minority—a very small minority—of our Nation's youth. The students of Sheridan Junior College understand why Americans fight in Vietnam, and they support our Government and our men in uniform.

There being no objection, the petition, with the signatures, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION CIRCULATED AT SHERIDAN JUNIOR COLLEGE

We, the undersigned, join with thousands of other students on the campuses of the United States in support of the American forces in their efforts in Vietnam:

LaVern Bjerk, Karen Barker, Lorretta Pendergraft, Alan South, Bob Finney, Dave DeLauter, Chris Sears, Lonnie Lindstrom, Dave Lenz, Fred Alley, Cedric Alley, Bernice King, Dick Legocki, Bill Workman, George Wing, Fred Buchanan, Chip Rhoads, Jerry Hampehire, Bill Petty, Judy Shannon, Coheri Haptionstall, Roger J. Themie.

Willa Miller, Jermaine Lehr, Janet Redies, Dave Parker, Fidding L. Childress, D. W. Clabaugh, Virginia Huzen, Judy Kirchman, Terry Harper, Stuart Briggs, Danny Heagney, Ray Barney, Tom Kinnison, Clayton Morris, June Montgomery, Linda Persons, Rocky Pedulla, Lois Garson, John Holstedt, Warren Kuhl, Tim Brown, Melvin Masted, Gregory White, Joan S. White, Virginia Wells.

Forest Dunning, Steve Jacobson, Tom Logan, Mary Anne Quintana, Kay Wallick, Pat Stresky, Nydia Rodriguez, Jim Urbatchka, Maj. Don Robbins, Dan Young, Wesley P. Lyles, Jr., Geora Jean Lanz, Rod Ford, Michael Thompson, Richard L. Rasmussan, Jill Streklaw, Judy Baker, Richard Pueete, Richard Tabema, Neil A. Brown, Bill King, Mary Jean Reeves, Marla Roch, Jackie Ouarterman.

Martin Anderson, Robert Bowen, Jim Connor, Ed Moore, John Aldrich, Larry Wakefield, Rusty David Bennett Anderson, Eldon Reed, Jim Kuyatt, Jack Sarratt, Jacque Miller, Donald G. Lavigne, Bill Hansen, Peggy Collins, Susan Mitchell, Alice Janney, Billie May Vielhauer, John Richard Lopez, Irene Hull, Norman McEwan, Janice Donnafield, Patricia Silla, Janet Schmidt, L. Bird, Jim Weddle, Joyce Bohnvack, Bill Stearns, Dave Conley, James Green, Wendy Westrick, Charlie Walker, Mike Sherman, Louie Torrence, Stanley S. Sheehan, Ken Calkins.

Space Wives Elated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we hear little of those who support our astronauts in reaching the goal of a lunar landing in this decade. Among our most important contributors to our national space effort are the wives of the astronauts themselves. An article in the Dallas Times Herald of December 17, 1965, gives a brief, interesting insight into the wonderful support these fine women are giving to the men who have accepted the challenge of space. They serve as an outstanding example of all of those in the space program who support our astronauts both directly and indirectly. The story of Mrs. Schirra and Mrs. Stafford is a heartwarming example for all Americans. The article follows:

SPACE WIVES ELATED

SEABROOK, TEX.—Mrs. Walter Schirra and Mrs. Thomas Stafford, thrilled by long-distance personal reports on history's first space rendezvous from their husbands, sent their children off to school today and finished preparations for Christmas.

Both wives talked for 6 minutes by radiotelephone with their astronaut husbands from the aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Wasp*. They said the conversations were "mostly about the flight."

Mrs. Schirra said her reaction to the sight of the astronauts popping out of the capsule and the Marine band on the ship playing "Anchors Aweigh" was "a feeling you can hardly describe."

Mrs. Stafford and the seven other astronaut wives who dropped in to watch the recovery on television celebrated with champagne.

Mrs. Stafford said seeing the space capsule hoisted aboard the carrier and the astronauts' safe emergence was "the greatest thing in the world."

Karin Stafford, 8, said her father looked bald on television.

Mrs. Frank Borman, whose husband is still in space aboard the Gemini 7 capsule, watched the recovery at Mrs. Stafford's home. Mrs. James Lovell, expecting a baby at the end of the month, was home for the splashdown. She planned a visit to her doctor today.

Mrs. Lovell, who had several friends over for coffee and cake after taking a nap, said her telephone was "ringing off the hook" with calls from friends excited about the Gemini 7 flight and rendezvous with Schirra and Stafford.

Jo Schirra and several friends later had a "Christmas tree raising" at the Schirras' home in suburban Timber Cove.

At the Stafford home for the recovery were Mrs. Borman, Jane Conrad, Jan Armstrong, Pat McDivitt, Marilyn See, Harriet Eisele, Barbara Young, and Mrs. Borman's sister, Ruth Bugbee of Tucson, Ariz.

Senator Muskie Urges Citizen Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

In a free society, there is really no way to achieve a more beautiful environment unless each individual citizen makes national beautification his personal responsibility.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, who spoke those words, has himself practiced what he preaches. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, he has led the way to enactment of legislation to control the poisoning of air and water, and he has pointed toward further progress by emphasizing intergovernmental cooperation and citizen participation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an interview with Senator MUSKIE entitled "This Must Be a Citizen Action Program," appearing in the General Electric Forum for October–December, be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS MUST BE A CITIZEN ACTION PROGRAM—AN INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE, CHAIRMAN, SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIR AND WATER POLLUTION

Question. To be truly effective, any national program must ultimately have the support and understanding of the individual citizen. In your view, why is a program of natural beautification important to the American people? What are some of the problems we face in this area?

The preservation of America's natural beauty really boils down to proper resource development and use. And within this subject there are no more pressing issues today than the twin problems of air and water pollution.

Not too many years ago, the demand of conservationists for water pollution abatement was greeted with the remark: "What do you want, payrolls or pickerel?" The answer, of course, was and is: "Both." We need ample supplies of high quality water for life, health, recreation, and industry. And, fortunately, more and more of our citizens recognize it.

The major difficulty is that air and water are limited resources. We have only so much of each, and we must find ways of reducing the pollution if we are to survive.

When our Nation was founded, the abundant supplies of clean water seemed limitless. They became our highways, sources of power and irrigation, and refuge for fish and wildlife. Unfortunately, the waterways also became an easy place to dump waste products, without thought to the consequences to future generations.

On a national scale the problem of water resources today has grown into one of major dimension. Every day we make more demands on our water supplies—for industrial, agricultural, personal, and recreational uses.

Within just 15 years, our requirements for water in the United States will outstrip supplies by at least 85 billion gallons per day. By the year 2000, the daily demand is expected to be 350 billion gallons greater than the supply. This means that we must accelerate our efforts to clean up fouled waters and to reuse water wherever possible, not only for swimming and fishing, but for drinking and industry as well.

Under these circumstances, making sure that enough water is available to everyone, everywhere, at all times will tax our technical skills, our ingenuity, and our capital resources, both public and private. There is, unfortunately, no cheap and easy solution to the problem of water pollution control and abatement.

INDUSTRY DEPENDS ON QUALITY WATER

There is a very close relationship between water quality and industrial development. In fact, water quality is at the heart of this Nation's future economic growth. Industry cannot flourish without quality water, and some cannot even exist without it.

In an economically distressed area in Maine, for example, a cannery was nearly forced to cancel plans for a new plant because no oxygen was left in the stream from which the cannery was to draw water for its processing. The problems were worked out, but this is a good example of how one area could have lost 300 jobs because of the condition of the river.

The problem is not limited, by the way, to surface water pollution. There are similar examples of industrial location decisions which were affected one way or another by the quality of underground water for wells.

On the east coast of the United States, the severe drought conditions which have plagued some areas for as much as 4 years have served to make everyone more aware than ever before of the difficult problems we have in managing water resources.

Air pollution is also becoming an economic problem of serious proportions. Its effects on health have, of course, been well documented and publicized. The most distressing example was the London smog of 1952, in which air pollution was blamed for some 4,000 deaths. Many respiratory diseases are being linked closely to air pollution by health authorities.

And air pollution also is responsible for roughly $11 billion a year in property damage to agriculture, city buildings and monuments, and individual homes.

Question. What challenges to Government—at all levels—are posed by problems of national beautification?

Because this is a national problem, there are naturally a number of legislative measures which have been enacted by Congress or which will be voted upon in the near future.

In 1963, Congress passed the Clean Air Act to stimulate the national effort to abate and control air pollution. This year Congress amended this legislation to require all new automobile engines to be equipped with devices or modified to control engine exhausts. Automobiles are the single largest source of air pollution, and the new requirements should reduce harmful emission from automobiles by up to 80 percent.

The amendments also accelerate research on the whole range of air pollution sources, and encourage municipalities to reduce air pollution from solid waste disposal facilities.

The Water Quality Act of 1965 has been enacted to amend the basic Water Pollution Control and Abatement Act, which was passed in 1961. The Water Quality Act provides for an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to supervise water pollution control activities. It also makes possible grants for additional pollution research and development, increases grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, and authorizes establishment of water quality standards on interstate waterways.

One of the key measures in the President's natural beauty program is the Highway Beautification Act which was passed by Congress this fall. This legislation authorizes use of Federal funds to help States control outdoor advertising and junkyards along 41,000 miles of interstate highways and 224,000 miles of primary roads.

In short, the Federal Government has a substantial role to play in research in encouraging cooperative programs, stimulating and supporting interstate, State and local programs, in encouraging compliance with quality standards, and in enforcement in such areas as interstate navigable streams where there has been a refusal to accept public responsibility.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION NEEDED

However, one of the most important challenges to government, in general, is to improve the coordination between Federal, State, and local government units. Much of the beautification effort is tied closely to governmental problems of metropolitan areas, where more than two-thirds of our citizens now live.

In most of these areas, there is a great problem of numerous, overlapping, and competing jurisdictions of local government. The average number of independent units of government per metropolitan area is 87. There are 1,060 in the Chicago area, and 1,400 in the greater New York region.

The State government also bears a responsibility for strengthening the basis of regional cooperation. Some States have reacted to this problem in a positive, forward-looking fashion, but many others have largely ignored it.

Question. How confident are you that the American public can be sufficiently aroused to make national and local beautification programs work effectively?

I think a great deal can be accomplished. We obviously need public support—for the same reason that we need such support for any legislative program. But outside the field of legislation, we must have public support because beautification is the responsibility of each citizen. Unless the individual accepts that responsibility in his daily life, we cannot possibly achieve a more beautiful environment.

Support comes easier for programs which are related to health or economics, such as air and water pollution control. I think the public is well aware of the seriousness of this situation.

But in the case of other beautification, the health and economic issues are not as clearcut. Billboard legislation, for example, involves cross currents of various benefits and disadvantages. Many motorists value highly the information on fuel, food, and lodgings which they read on billboards. Others say they want the scenic beauty unblemished by man-made structures. So we must balance the many interests of the casual motorists, the small businessmen, and the conservationists to work out practical compromises.

It may be that in the future, health and economic reasons for beautification efforts will be secondary. The quality of the life we lead may itself become the strongest motivating force for natural beauty programs.

Question. What are some of the gains which can be made in the next 10 years in pollution control and other beautification efforts?

We are making a good start in the control of air pollution through legislation passed this year which requires exhaust control on all cars beginning with the 1968 models. Of course, even if 70 to 80 percent of the hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide that an auto discharges into the air is reduced, there is still not likely to be any visible change in the atmosphere of our cities by 1975. There will simply be so many more cars by then that the gains will be offset by the sheer numbers of vehicles. On the other hand, if we do not achieve significant exhaust control, I do not like to think what our urban atmosphere will be like 10 years from now.

In the case of water pollution, over the next 10 years we ought to be able to achieve very dramatic gains in the appearance and quality of our rivers and waterways. It doesn't take long for streams to cleanse themselves, if there is a fast enough current flow, once the pollutants cease to enter them. This is going to mean a massive investment by Federal, State, and local governments in order to build the great numbers of sewage treatment plants needed.

Certainly, if we succeed in effectively controlling outdoor advertising on our streets and highways, there can be a dramatic improvement over a 10-year period. Tree and flower planting, various forms of landscaping, can produce dramatic changes in very short times, as already can be noted here in the Washington area.

But whatever beautification is accomplished cannot come by law or force from above. This must be a citizen action program. If each individual would take it upon himself to conduct a one-man crusade against litter and dirt, that alone would bring a startling change in the appearance of our cities—not in 10 years, but in 1 year.

In a free society, there is really no way to achieve a more beautiful environment unless each individual citizen makes national beautification his personal responsibility.

Wisconsin Pioneer and National Leader in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the people of Wisconsin believe that education is the best investment that can be made in our youth, our society, and our Nation.

Wisconsin pioneered the public kindergarten. Our State spends $498 per pupil throughout our public school system, compared to the national average of $455. Here is a big reason why only 8 percent of Wisconsin youth fail the selective service mental test, compared to the national average of 24 percent.

Equally important is the contribution to higher education. The Marshall and Ilsley Bank, in the Milwaukee Sentinel, reminds us that the University of Wisconsin confers 3.85 percent of the academic doctor's degrees in the United States. Yet Wisconsin has only 2.2 percent of the Nation's population.

Only three other universities enroll more students from other countries than does the University of Wisconsin. Only five have more full-time students. Only two have produced more holders of doctorates who have become Federal executives.

But that is not all. Wisconsin has 7 private junior colleges, 18 private colleges, and 2 private universities.

More than 90 percent of Wisconsin's high school graduates can reach a private or public college in less than 1 hour. Most are within 35 miles.

I ask unanimous consent, that this excellent digest of Wisconsin's educational achievements be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

You would be hard pressed to do better—for your son or daughter. Facilities and faculty for higher education rank among the best in the Nation. In fact, there are more students from other States attending Wisconsin colleges than there are State students who study elsewhere. Only three universities—California, New York, and Columbia enroll more students from other parts of the world. With only 2.2 percent of the population, Wisconsin grants 2.34 percent of bachelor and professional degrees and 3.85 percent of the doctorates in the United States. Our State university, sixth largest in the Nation in full-time students, is a leader in both size and reputation.

Only two schools in the country have produced more doctorate holders who have become Federal executives. The University of Wisconsin ranks 10th in number of alumni who have become presidents of the Nation's largest corporations. What may be even more important to you are the excellent private colleges in the State. There are 7 junior colleges, 18 colleges and 2 universities (Marquette and Lawrence). More than 90 percent of Wisconsin high school graduates are within 1 hour's drive of a public or private college. Most students are within a radius of 35 miles. This is particularly important when you consider that the two most expensive items of a college education are room and board. Tuition amounts to only 20 percent of the total. Emphasis on education in our State starts early. Wisconsin is the birthplace of the public kindergarten. We spend $498 per pupil in average daily attendance compared to a national average of $455. This no doubt helps account for the fact that only 8.1 percent of Wisconsin youths fail the Selective Service preinduction mental test—compared to a U.S. average of 24.5 percent. This excellent educational picture is only one reason why people and industries are turning to Wisconsin as a place to locate, to do business and to live. They like it here.

Keys to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation recently conducted an essay contest on the subject of "Keys to Freedom," and a number of the prize-winning essays of Wyoming authors were forwarded to me.

I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the essay by Miss Bonnie Miller, of Albin, Wyo., who won first prize in the junior division. I ask that Miss Miller's essay be printed in the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Keys to Freedom

Today, according to a leading newspaper, we have 125,000 Americans fighting in Vietnam. They are fighting that this American heritage which we possess will remain free. There are 125,000 of our men there now, and I understand that by Christmas the draftees to that country will be increased to 250,000 to fight against the communistic forces of that area.

The draft board has called my brother to take his physical October 6, and if he should be drafted, he too, will be fighting with the others that they might find the key to unlock a door to freedom. Neither my brother nor any other one individual can win this war alone and neither do we have any assurance that these forces working together can win this war. But one thing is sure—each individual can do his duty and can assume his responsibility. And only if each one does assume his responsibility, can we expect the desired freedom for Vietnam and a blockage of Communist forces against our own country.

Not only must our Americans fight on the field abroad, but we must assume our responsibility and fight for continued freedom on the homefront as well.

Farm bureau members believe that the apparent lack of responsibility on the part of individual citizens is a great danger threatening our Republic and our system of competitive enterprise. Let me revise this to say that the lack of individual responsibility could take away our freedom. Each individual citizen is vitally important to this agricultural program, to this Vietnam war, and to this world, as long as he does his best. Freedom is not given to us; our forefathers assumed their responsibility and fought for it. When our English ancestors came to America as Pilgrims they suffered many hardships. During the first bleak winter in Plymouth Colony over half the English colonists died. But when the *Mayflower* sailed back to England that following spring the survivors stayed to make America their home and to carve the American heritage. These settlers did not take the easy way out.

However, the era when the slaves were imported into this country is a reverse story. Natives of this United States were seeking the easy way out by importing Negro slaves to do their work for them. They paid for their laziness dearly in the Civil War which was the second bloodiest war in history. World War II had the greatest number of battle deaths. So you can see that the easiest way is seldom the best way.

Not only must we fight for freedom but we must also exercise that freedom which we possess.

Freedom is likened to the parable Christ gave of the talents as recorded in Matthew 25. A master, going on a journey, entrusted a talent to his servant, and the servant, being afraid he might lose it, put it a way for safekeeping instead of investing it. The master returned and seeing the unwise decision of his servant, in anger took the talent from him.

By not taking advantage of our freedom we run the risk of losing it as the servant lost his talent. Each individual holds in his hand a key to freedom and we cannot leave the door locked. We cannot stand still and at the same time gain freedom. We must produce. Production is no doubt a familiar word to farm bureau members, so let each of us plant a farm bureau garden.

First, let's plant four rows of peas: (1) preparedness; (2) promptness; (3) politeness; (4) perseverance.

Preparedness to meet the challenge of each day; promptness in doing the duties of each day; politeness toward your neighbor each day; and preseverance in our responsibilities of each day.

Next plant three rows of squash: (1) squash gossip; (2) squash criticism; (3) squash indifference.

Now let us plant four rows of lettuce in our garden: (1) let us be faithful; (2) let us be truthful; (3) let us be loyal; (4) let us be unselfish.

Let us be faithful to this farm bureau organization; let us be truthful to our family, to our friends, to our enemies, and to ourselves; let us be loyal to this great American country and its heritage; and let us be unselfish toward all.

And no garden is complete without turnips so let's plant some: (1) turn up for volunteer work; (2) turn up with a smile; (3) turn up with determination.

Once this garden is planted in each individual's heart and character, he will hold in his hand an important key to freedom: a key that can open a door and remove the dangers that are threatening this American Republic and our competitive enterprise system. A key that can defeat the communistic forces. I offer to you a challenge to assume your duties and to develop your individual responsibility—a key to freedom.

"Yes, Folks, There Is a Santa Claus"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we hear much these days about the Federal antipoverty programs and the good work they are doing. We don't hear much about the things left undone.

The Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader pointed this up on January 2, in a heartwarming letter to the editor entitled "Yes, Folks, There Is a Santa Claus." This letter details how one man, working on short notice, with the cooperation of public spirited citizens of his community, was able to provide a merry Christmas for 350 Indian children. There is a lesson for everyone in this article and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Jan. 2, 1966]

YES, FOLKS, THERE IS A SANTA CLAUS

To the EDITOR OF THE ARGUS-LEADER:

Yes, folks, there is a Santa Claus. Many persons search all their lives, looking for a fat little man in a red suit, to bring them good fortune, but never find him. This is because they do not know how to look.

He is not a single person and not a myth, but a spirit which has its potential in every man. Santa Claus is the spirit of Christmas. Each must develop his own concept of the spirit of Christmas, but it is surprising to find exactly who does become Santa Claus when the chips are down. To illustrate my point, let me tell you a little story.

There are some very important people in a big city called Washington who are trying to create the Great Society. They want to be Santa Claus to everyone, especially the "underprivileged." They have developed a great poverty program which will bring aid, assistance, and benefit to all of the poor of this country and eventually to the entire world.

They have promised that all of the underprivileged will be helped, their lot will be made happier, they will receive more education so as to be able to make a better living for themselves. Unfortunately, somewhere along the line the money which was appropriated for all this got lost and did not reach the people who needed it the most, the poor.

Many of the Indian children who attend the Government schools in this State are about the neediest persons in South Dakota, but they are ineligible for the poverty program funds, because they are at a Government school.

The gigantic sum of slightly less than $1[illegible] is appropriated per year by the important men in Washington to clothe each Indian child at these Government schools. After the necessary items of apparel are bought, there is not much money left for Christmas presents.

About 10 days before Christmas I visited one of the schools for the Indian children. It seems that for various reasons the children from this school are not able to go home for Christmas and must remain there over the holidays. Last year, only 1 child in a dormitory which housed 150 children received a gift from his family at Christmas and very few of the parents visited their children during the holiday time.

Attempts were made by officials at the school this year to place children in homes of the local community and in neighboring towns, but with very little success. Most of the children do not have a very merry Christmas as each of us has come to think of it.

After hearing of this situation, where about 350 children could not be home for Christmas, who would probably not receive any Christmas presents, who were resigned to Christmas as just another day, I took the problem to many civic-minded persons, businessman and merchants in our own community.

Folks, I found Santa Claus. Despite the fact that my plea was late; the donations for Christmas long since planned and made; the late Christmas sales being in progress; the citizens of this community who were contacted responded almost unanimously with such generosity that I was overwhelmed. The gifts which they gave were taken to the Indian children in time for Christmas. I am sure that these 350 youngsters experienced a Christmas which will live long in their memories.

In this letter I have not personally identified the kind persons who gave so generously to the Indian children, for this reason: We did not learn of this problem until it was too late to contact each and every individual who might have liked to participate in this project. Some who were not contacted might feel slighted. If you desire to know who the generous people were, I can tell you.

Yes, folks, there is a Santa Claus. Santa Claus is every man and every man is potentially Santa Claus. You just have to find the right man at the right time. If you wait for the Great White Father in Washington to be Santa Claus, it will be a long, long wait. Perhaps, as in this instance, it would be better if we took care of more things like this ourselves.

JOHN B. GREGG.

SIOUX FALLS.

We Help Ourselves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, one of the most effective efforts to help disadvantaged persons break out of their cycle of poverty is being conducted in Philadelphia by the opportunities industrialization center under the leadership of the Reverend Leon Howard Sullivan. I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the center's activities, which appeared in the Reader's Digest of No[illegible] 19[illegible], be printed in the appendix [illegible]

[illegible] bein[illegible]on, the article [illegible]rdered to [illegible]n the RECORD, [illegible]lows:

WE HE[illegible]ELVES

(By Pau[illegible]iggins)

[illegible]utes' ride from the prideful new g[illegible]-steel skyscrapers of downtown Philadelphia lies a nightmarish Negro world: six city wards of squalid streets and rotting red brick tenements, packed with 270,000 people and faced with appalling want and social decay. This area, which Mayor James H. J. Tate declared had "the most crime, tuberculosis, venereal disease, unemployment and poverty in all of Philadelphia," is in fact one of the worst slums in the United States. Yet here, in an abandoned police station rented from the city for 1 dollar a year, a militant Negro minister, Leon Howard Sullivan, has launched one of the most exciting and hopeful programs in America.

"We help ourselves," is the program's motto and philosophy. Its "Opportunities Industrialization Center" (OIC), the first enterprise of its kind in the Nation, is designed not only to give Negroes new job skills, but also to inspire them with hope, confidence, and a new way of looking at themselves and at life. It is this emphasis on attitude which distinguishes OIC from almost all other current job-training efforts, and which in just 19 months has made this bold venture, in the words of Mayor Tate, "a model for the rest of the country." Consider some of its significant accomplishments:

Of OIC's first 500 "graduates," who took 8-week to 1-year courses in everything from power sewing and restaurant practices to electronics and sheetmetal work, a phenomenal 80 percent were almost immediately placed in good jobs.

Probably one-third of the OIC trainees now taking jobs are shifting from the relief rolls—good news indeed for Philadelphia, where Negro welfare costs have soared to over $100 million a year.

In a notable innovation, OIC is giving special prejob training to some 1,000 Negroes at a time, helping them to brush up on their reading, writing, arithmetic, and to improve their speech and even personal grooming.

Originally aiming to train some 2,500 individuals a year, but swamped with over 6,000 applicants on its opening day, OIC is already expanding with two branches. To house the first, a Philadelphia philanthropist turned over a six-story office building. This new branch offers training in department-store selling, merchandising, and small-business operation. A second, recently opened, gives training in laundry, dry cleaning, and building trade skills, among other courses.

Already, OIC has won the enthusiastic support of the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce and the white power structure. "Businessmen have come to understand that the position of the Negro involves more than a moral principle; the future of our community is at stake," W. Thacher Longstreth, executive vice president of the Philadelphia chamber, told me. "Either we give the Negro tools to compete, or we resign ourselves to perpetual handouts and unconscionable welfare problems." And, typifying the new spirit, Sullivan declares: "The Negro has learned to demonstrate and to protest, but in Philadelphia now we recognize that he must also prepare himself and produce."

TABLE D'HOTE AND A LA CARTE

One morning recently, I drove out to the North Philadelphia slums to see this inspiring project in action. At OIC, I was greeted by its creator, the Reverend Leon Howard Sullivan.

Six-foot-five and an athletic 235 pounds, the ebullient Baptist preacher showed me around the transformed police station. Using $50,000 from an anonymous donor, and dime-to-dollar contributions from Negro parishioners and other well-wishers, Sullivan, with the help of carpenters, plumbers, and painters, had completely renovated a rat-infested former jail.

Where once police had booked drunks, dope addicts, and muggers, I entered a spick-and-span restaurant, cheerful with canary-yellow walls, colorful curtains, and modern furnishings. "We painted everything bright: the Negro needs a lift," Sullivan explained. A class in restaurant practices was in progress, with a group of young Negro girls seated around their teacher. "We're learning table settings, and the difference between table d'hote and a la carte," their instructor told me.

But she was teaching infinitely more, I discovered: poise, positive attitudes of courtesy, and the importance of food service as an ever-growing industry. Later, I learned that a graduate of OIC had become night manager for a downtown branch of a food chain—motivation, indeed, for the trainees.

In another room, young Negroes sat before a battery of chattering machines learning how to become teletypewriter operators. The talk was all about two OIC graduates: a girl who had just got her first job after only 6 weeks' instruction; and a young man who was back for advanced training. "As soon as I finish another 5 weeks, I'm promised a transfer to a branch office where I'll be the main operator," he said proudly.

I followed Sullivan upstairs. "We didn't have even a screwdriver to start," he told me. "Now look at this—a quarter-million dollars of the finest equipment, all donated by Philadelphia industry: Philco, General Electric, Budd, and Bell Telephone, among others. We're in business."

Down the hall, in a huge sunny room, Negro housewives, many of them on relief, were learning power sewing in a 9-weeks' course. "We make actual garments for charity," a young mother said, holding up a dress. "Man, you should see me put in a zipper." Sullivan led the way to the basement: what had once been a dank, dark hole with ankle-deep water was now a sheetmetal and machine-tool shop complete with whirring lathes and eager trainees.

YOU ARE SOMEBODY

I talked to several OIC graduates: the young woman now holding her first good job in a garment factory; the papercutter who realized his 15-year ambition to get into electronics; and Bob Fisher, a 30-year-old man with a wife and 7 children. He had been "reorganized" out of his steelmill job and forced onto welfare. Fisher took 9 months' training in machine-tool operation at OIC, and today earns $3 an hour as a turret-lathe operator. "We're paying the bills now," he told me, with emotion. "It's like a year of storms, and then all of a sudden the sun starts shining."

How has OIC succeeded where other schools have failed?

"I think the difference," Sullivan explained, "is that people come in here without fear of being ridiculed or turned away, and they see a job at the end." The typical school program is apt to be too academic; OIC tries to reach people where they are. It isn't the diploma or report card that counts, but a job.

"Here, they show you what other Negroes have done," a shy but ambitious student told me. Said another, "For the first time, they make you realize that you are somebody."

REACHING THE UNREACHED

With this fresh, uplifting approach, Sullivan's self-help program immediately paid dividends. But it also uncovered serious problems: thousands of these disadvantaged—people from broken homes or on welfare, unwed mothers, some illiterates—needed preliminary training even to enter OIC.

To overcome this deficiency, and also to give some training and incentive to the 6,000 hopefuls on the waiting lists, Sullivan pioneered his unique prejob program. He obtained another abandoned building, this time a synagogue, where 1,000 Negro men and women hurried to enroll in a 3 months' special course. The dingy, abandoned temple was partitioned into tiny, noisy cubicles scarcely conducive to teaching of any kind.

Yet here, under such inspiring banners as "Get ready for opportunity," I listened to some memorable classes. Frequently, Philadelphia businessmen were scheduled to talk about jobs and how to get them. Such Negro idols as Jackie Robinson have spoken to the trainees. "You have to face the same obstacles I had to face," Jackie told the prejob school. "But with faith and confidence, you will win."

As often as he finds the time, the tireless Sullivan visits the classes to preach attitude. "Sit up straight, young man," he frequently admonishes slouching students. "Stick it out," he urges the frustrated and floundering. "You don't have to spend the rest of your lives on handouts and welfare. You are part of a historic demonstration, and upon your performance will depend the futures of 20 million persons in our big cities who have been brainwashed into thinking they are inferior. But I tell you the Negro is not inferior, and genius is colorblind."

Thus with Negro telling Negro, Philadelphia is embarked on one of the most far-reaching and significant programs not only for the Negro race, but for our entire complex industrial society. "Reaching the unreached," Sullivan calls it.

Recently, the old synagogue was swept by a disastrous fire, but with the temporary use of a National Guard Armory offered by Gov. William Scranton, the resolute Sullivan and his devoted staff carried on with the vital prejob program.

BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE

Leon Sullivan, himself a product of Charleston, W. Va., slums, grew up in a broken home "on a dirt alley"—his mother was a $13-a-week elevator operator, his father a janitor. After being ordained, he promptly took his ministry to the streets. He organized an outstanding youth-employment program in Philadelphia, for which he won the Freedom Foundation Award. But not long ago, Sullivan's name was a fighting word in Philadelphia business circles.

In an attempt to win more jobs for Negroes, he had spearheaded an aggressive consumer boycott against 29 top Philadelphia companies. But the important thing was that jobs began to open, and Negro leaders realized that unless something was done fast, there wouldn't be enough qualified Negroes around to fill them. So Sullivan conceived the idea of training through OIC.

Fortunately for Philadelphia, the business community and the Negro leaders shared the same fundamental concerns; even before Sullivan's boycott, the chamber of commerce was hard at work on the general problem. "We had thousands of jobs going begging while we had more than 100,000 unemployed," Keeton Arnett, then chairman of the economic leader group and now consultant to both the Philadelphia Chamber and to OIC, told me. "Our only resource," says Arnett, "was the unemployed labor force, largely unskilled and largely Negro."

When Sullivan's idea of Negroes training Negroes to help themselves came up, the chamber of commerce promptly threw in its resources and support. Recognizing a venture that might well be a model for the Nation, the U.S. Department of Labor stepped in with a $458,000 grant for the prejob school—probably the first program of its kind in the world. The Negroes raised $100,000 in a citywide drive; business and industry contributed, and during this past summer, OIC's program was granted $1,756,163 by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Yet for all of its success, the Philadelphia venture is still a pilot project, with problems. "For one thing, the level of educational achievement of most students is so low that it has taken much longer than we had anticipated to teach basic skills," says Sullivan.

Naturally, with its initial success, OIC is attracting a flock of visitors to study the program. "Will the blueprint succeed elsewhere?" they want to know. Philadelphia leaders with whom I talked are convinced it will, but with some important qualifications:

Negro and white leaders must sit down together; accept their mutual economic dependence; and recognize that this is a problem not only for the Negro, but for everybody. The chances for success will be vastly greater if both sides are able to develop the tolerance, understanding, and constructive leadership represented in Philadelphia. Whenever communities are able to achieve this spirit, we can mark another milestone in race relations and opportunity in the United States.

Wisconsin College Students Support Vietnam Policy 3 to 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if there is one group in America which is according to myth critical of U.S. policy in Vietnam, it is the college age, draft age youth. And if there is one section that has been at times more isolationist, it has been the Midwest and Wisconsin. In the light of this, recent polls on attitudes toward our Vietnam policies at State universities in Wisconsin are very interesting indeed.

At Wisconsin State University at Whitewater, 73 percent of students polled in a Vietnam policy referendum support the present position of the United States. Of the remaining 27 percent, 5 percent responded as undecided rather than opposed.

It is interesting and heartening to note that students of the freshman and sophomore classes most heavily voted in favor of our policy of refusing to yield to pressure and threats against the people of South Vietnam.

I also am informed that students at two other Wisconsin State universities showed their approval of their Government's policy. The vote at those universities was between 70 and 80 percent favorable.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief article from the Royal Purple, the campus newspaper at Wisconsin State University at Whitewater, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEVENTY-THREE PERCENT SUPPORT U.S. VIETNAM POLICY

Seventy-three percent of the student body who voted in Thursday's Vietnam policy referendum favor present U.S. policy according to Tom Hickinbotham, student council vice president.

Seven hundred ninty-five students voted in the referendum. Twenty-two percent said they did not favor present policy and 5 percent were undecided.

All students—6,322—were eligible to vote in the referendum.

The results will be sent to United Council Legislative Committee Chairman Frank Boyle to be included with referendum results at the eight other State universities.

The light turnout was probably due to student's ignorance of the Vietnam situation and U.S. policy, Hickinbotham said. Other State universities held rallies prior to referendums he said and the response was greater.

Other universities' results available at this time indicate strong student support for U.S. policy toward Vietnam.

BREAKDOWN BY CLASSES

Senior class: men, yes 88, no 36, undecided 1; percent in favor, 70.4. Women, yes 24, no 4, undecided 4; percent in favor, 75. Total vote, 157; percent in favor 71.9.

Junior class: Men, yes 77, no 40, undecided 7; percent in favor, 62.1. Women, yes 38, no 10, undecided 5; percent in favor 71.7. Total vote 177; percent in favor 64.9.

Sophomore class: Men, yes 103, no 28, undecided 10; percent in favor 73. Women, yes 66, no 17, undecided 3; percent in favor 76.7. Total vote 227; percent in favor 74.5.

Freshman class: Men, yes 119, no 28, undecided 3; percent in favor 79.3. Women, yes 68, no 13, undecided 3; percent in favor 80.9. Total vote 234; percent in favor 79.9.

The Key to Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 14, 1966

Mr. SIMPSON. The Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation recently conducted an essay contest on the subject of "Keys to Freedom," and a number of the prize-winning essays by Wyoming authors were forwarded to me.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the essay on this subject by Mrs. Ellen Forbes, of Sheridan County, Wyo., who placed first in the senior division. I ask that Mrs. Forbes' essay be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE KEY TO FREEDOM

A key must fit its lock. In order, therefore, to consider what the key to freedom might be, it is necessary first to examine the concept of freedom itself. Since freedom has been synonymous with liberty throughout the American experience, I will use the two words interchangeably in this paper.

To Americans, "freedom" and "liberty" are words which are known and used from earliest school days. "Liberty" and "freedom," as words, occur again and again in those documents which have become sacred to our American heritage. They are attractive words and are consequently used often, but frequently without real thought or understanding. How many a first grader has gone through an entire year ending the flag pledge, "with liverty and justice for all"?

When considered seriously, however, freedom and liberty are more than words repeated in the flag pledge, memorized in the Gettysburg Address, or read in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. They are living concepts, vital to us as Americans. They cannot be taken for granted and will not be so ignored by anyone realizing the challenge offered by the totalitarian threat today.

A striking example today of a group of people who are vitally concerned with freedom as a true and living reality are the West Berliners. An ideal must be confronted with a challenge and tested for it to become a conviction. The West Berliners are people whose lives are a daily testimony to this truth. Freedom is no longer an ideal to them; it is a conviction.

Crowded into a small oasis of freedom, entirely urban in nature, over 2 million people live entirely surrounded by the Communist satellite nation of East Germany. The two sections of Berlin have been, since the erection of the wall in 1961, virtually two different cities. The wall, topped with broken glass and barbed wire, its massive solidarity punctuated with watchtowers, pacing bloodhounds on 24-hour vigil, and occasional flashes of light as sunlight meets metal of bayonet or binoculars, is the grim daily reminder to these people of how precious and tentative freedom can be. What a use for the barbed wire which was first invented for the cattlemen of the Western Plains. But in this small although crucial area of the world, freedom can be the width of one narrow wall or the nine persons who lose their lives for the one who escapes without harm.

Will we Americans have to be completely surrounded by an authoritarian system, pushed to the point where each day our freedom is held in delicate balance, before we no longer take our heritage for granted? Because historical and geographical factors for the America of the 1960's are far different from those which led to the phenomenon of a divided Germany and Berlin, physical strangulation may not be a threat. We could, however, fall prey to an ideological bondage, for ideas know no mountain, river, ocean, or manmade line as a boundary. Science and technology have virtually shrunk the physical world to the size of a pinhead; it is for us to see that social and economic problems which have mushroomed with urbanization and a rapidly increasing population, do not reduce our ideological heritage to the same minute scope.

Many of us have too long assumed that freedom was a gift miraculously handed down from generation to generation, and further that it would always be ours to pass on to our children. We have not bothered to comprehend what life might be like were we to be denied this freedom. However, inherent in the concept of freedom is the responsibility to preserve it. We cannot think of freedom as simply the absence of restraints, the 7-year-old's dream of being able to do what one pleases. For man to be truly free, there must be a balance between the individual's rights and the limits he has imposed on himself via society. Should the rights of the individual become too heavily weighted, the result would be anarchy. This is as antithetical to freedom as the other alternative: absolute authority.

The key to freedom today is education. In the first place it is education which enhances the integrity of the individual so that he will feel strongly enough about his individuality to stand up for his rights and the rights of all mankind, and not become as inhuman as the numbers by which he is now identified.

Secondly, it is education which makes freedom meaningful in light of the totalitarian challenge. This includes insight into the nature of totalitarianism, the American heritage, and it involves travel, either actual or vicarious, to experience firsthand the uniqueness of each nation and realize by comparison those things which are a source of pride and are so precious to Americans.

Thirdly, and equally important, it is education which develops an informed and concerned electorate of individuals who take an active part in the political and economic life of the Nation, furthering the democratic form of government and the free enterprise system.

Education in this broad sense is not confined to the classroom nor to those between the ages of 5 and 21. It is a continuing and integral part of any vigorous and active life. A well-educated populace is vital to the future well-being of America and to the preservation of the concept of freedom for the next generation. A meaningful education which gets people to think for themselves in a constructive manner is the single sure bulwark against an authoritarian ideology. As a nation we must be morally strong. Freedom must be more than an ideal to which we give lipservice; to be secure it must become a conviction with each one of us. To assure a good fit, the lock must be reexamined on occasion and the shape of the key, but not its nature, should be adjusted accordingly. So, too, must we reevaluate our concept of freedom and adjust our philosophy of education so that the two may be congruent.

Appendix

Acheson on Our Vietnam Policy: An Asian Greece

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Dean Acheson, one of our outstanding Secretaries of State, and during a trying period in our country's and the world's history has written an interesting and sound article on South Vietnam, which appeared in the Washington Star of January 16, 1966. The views of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, which I include in my remarks, are worthy of profound consideration.

ACHESON ON OUR VIETNAM POLICY: AN ASIAN GREECE

(By Dean Acheson)

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The country referred to was poor, its poverty aggravated by foreign occupation and years of warfare. Guerrillas were creating political chaos and making economic recovery impossible. The existence of the state itself was threatened by large forces supplied, organized, and led by neighboring Communist movements. Many of these forces had taken part in the struggle against foreign occupation.

The Communist leaders had previously signed an agreement for peace but had hidden their weapons and resumed the conflict at the first signs of recovery. The national military forces were unequal to the renewed, foreign aided and directed attack.

The country's government was far from any democratic ideal. Previous aid had proved inadequate. The American Government had to decide whether to go further with funds, armaments, and the necessary military advisers. The President's conclusion was summed up in the sentence quoted above.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE

The year was 1947, the country, Greece; the President, Truman; and the policy enunciated, the Truman doctrine. It instantly received bipartisan support in Congress and for nearly 20 years, during four administrations, has been the policy of the United States. Under it necessary help was given in Greece, Turkey, Korea, Lebanon, and now in Vietnam to prevent Communist takeover "by armed minorities or by outside pressure," or by both.

Nineteen years ago, when the policy was first adotped, the United States was in the early stages of its education in methods of Communist conquest. In the immediate postwar years it learned how, in countries occupied by Soviet armies, Communist regimes were set up under the protection and opposition liquidated. This happened throughout Eastern Europe.

The next step was attempted in countries left in confusion by the war but not occupied by Soviet troops. Here internal subversion, instigated and supplied and controlled by outside Communist states, made an armed bid to take over the government. This was the form used in Greece and eastern Turkey. The Truman doctrine labeled this as aggressive Communist expansion and announced the necessity of stopping it. The aggression failed due to massive help given by the United States.

The next stage of the Communist assault did away with pretense. South Korea was openly invaded by organized army units from the Communist base outside. American and allied Armed Forces successfully came to the aid of South Korea.

WAR OF LIBERATION

The current method of Communist expansion, employed in Vietnam, is the so-called war of national liberation. In these wars there is an attempt, as there was in Greece, to cloak as an internal insurrection Communist subversion directed and supplied from outside, and there is added a Korea-like invasion by regular army formations from the neighboring Communist state.

Our decision to help South Vietnam resist this attempted subjugation involves principles and policies, all of which were already public and established by 1950. They in turn resulted from an appreciation of the lessons of the 1930's—Manchuria, Ethiopia, the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia—that aggression must either be met early before it has gathered momentum or it will have to be checked later under more adverse conditions.

SAME OLD COMPLAINTS

The complaints now raised at protest meetings on Vietnam are the same which have been directed against all our efforts to aid peoples resisting Communist subjugation. Our opponents are usually praised and those we are aiding criticized.

We were told that the terrorists, guerrilas, and belligerents in Greece were patriots who had fought the Nazis and whose aim was to replace a corrupt, demoralized government; that the evidence that they were serving foreign Communist purposes was flimsy; and that the United States was intervening in a purely Greek civil war. On the other hand, the Greek Government was denounced as weak, unrepresentative of the people, particularly of the resistance, and as the creature of the Western allies.

Similar unflattering comments were made about the late Syngman Rhee, President of Korea. But the fact now seems too plain for argument that in both Greece and Korea, the intervention and help of the United States preserved the opportunity to develop toward democratic government by consent. No such similar development can be noted in neighboring Balkan States or North Korea.

So, today, it is argued that government in Vietnam is not and has not been democratic and, therefore, is unworthy of American support. But the existence of a democratic system is not the criterion of worthiness of American support. That criterion is determined and demonstrated effort in resisting attempted subjugation. Can there be more impressive evidence of such determination and effort among the people of South Vietnam than they are now giving? For they are fighting on after suffering military and civilian casualties which on the basis of comparative populations are equal to nearly 1 million American casualties. Their purely military casualties on the same basis are fully 10 times greater than those we suffered in Korea.

When, as in China and Cuba, a government facing Communist-led forces failed to retain the support of its people, its numerically superior forces simply melted away. But in South Vietnam the government forces continue to grow in numbers and aggressiveness.

Not a single political figure or politically significant group in South Vietnam at the time Diem was overthrown or since has shifted allegiance to the Vietcong or been unwilling to continue the struggle.

MILLION REFUGEES

Finally, there is the record of those who voted with their feet, the million refugees who left the north for South Vietnam after the Geneva accord of 1954 and the hundreds of thousands of refugees who in 1965 alone have left Vietcong areas for government-controlled ones. The South Vietanamese people and army are fully justifying American assistance by willingly continuing to bear the brunt of what remains their struggle for independence.

Fortunately, there is also in Saigon and in Washington not only determination to suppress the belligerency, but an understanding of the importance of political consent in furthering the struggle for independence.

In South Vietnam, even in the midst of devastating warfare, the maneuvering and instability which have characterized the government since the fall of Diem show both a shift in power and attempts to reach the new balance by taking into account the aspirations of the Buddhists, the Catholics, the civilian politicians, the military establishment, students, the sects, and the geographic regions.

The search for such a balance is not a substitute for political method, but there has also been progress in that direction. Though it seems to have largely escaped public notice, elections for the municipal and provincial councils were held in South Vietnam last May. Observers agree that they were conducted in a fair and orderly manner and that the candidates substantially reflected local sentiments. Over half the eligible voters were registered and over 70 percent of those registered actually voted. In North Vietnam there can be found, of course, no glimmering of democratic political method.

VITAL TO UNITED STATES

The fate of the people of Vietnam is of the same vital concern to the United States as that of those whom in the past we have helped to resist subjugation. Indeed the situation in Asia today is reminiscent of the problems the United States confronted in Europe in 1947. The United States faces in Communist China an aggressive nation imbued with the same primitive Communist theology which the Soviet Union had 20 years ago, and possessing (as the Soviet Union did) military resources far greater than those of her neighbors. The area to the south, afflicted by foreign occupation and years of war, offers an invitation to aggression by means of the war of national liberation. Only the United States has the resources to make resistance possible.

The Chinese Communists have made it clear that Vietnam is another test of that strategy in Asia for the aggrandisement of the Communist world. The Communist Chinese minister of defense, Marshal Lin Piao, in a speech on September 3, referring to North America and Western Europe as the "cities of the world" and to Asia, Africa, and Latin America as the "rural areas," declared that "contemporary world revolution also presents a picture of the encirclement of cities by the rural areas." In its policy of "encirclement of the cities." Southeast Asia has the strategic significance of flanking the Indian subcontinent, facing the Philippines, and straddling the passage from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean.

With appropriate discount for verbal bluster, Communist China has shown an appreciation of the realities of power. There is surely no territory which Communist China desires more ardently than Formosa. Nevertheless, China's recognition of the vast force which the United States can bring to bear in Asia has caused the Communist leadership to refrain from attacking Formosa. The same appreciation of superior might is shown by Chinese unwillingness directly to challenge the United States in Southeast Asia.

The American aim in South Vietnam is neither to destroy China nor North Vietnam. It is rather to continue the policy established by President Truman of assisting free nations to resist subjugation until the Communist states become convinced that cheap victories are not possible and that the cost of aggression is too great.

The success of this policy may be seen in the growing moderation which has marked Russian policy in the past 15 years. In time China, too, may grasp the fact that aggression is unrewarding and choose to focus her energies on her vast internal problems while playing a more mature role in the international system.

Brooklyn Public Library Preschool Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this year the Congress will be considering renewal of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964—Public Law 88-269. In this connection it is of interest to note the use the Brooklyn Public Library has made of these funds through its preschool programs.

From the start of the Brooklyn project in mid-February of last year to the end of October, a total of 2.442 programs had been presented for 36,217 children between the ages of 3 and 5. The programs were presented at day care centers, public and parochial schools, housing projects, community centers, churches, and libraries throughout Brooklyn.

The sessions have been conducted by preschool library aids, college graduates interested in working with young children. These aids have been given intensive training to introduce them to the Brooklyn Public Library's philosophy of service, the selection of materials for youngsters, as well as the techniques of presentation. There are 16 of these library aids and they present an average of 70 to 73 programs weekly.

A typical preschool program may be divided into two parts and last approximately an hour. The first and formal half is devoted to telling stories, separated either by poetry, songs, finger games or imaginative play. During the second, or browsing part, the storyteller distributes books used in the program as well as others she has brought for the children.

Programs such as this play a constructive role in orienting young children toward learning and are illustrative of the dividends from Public Law 88-269, the Library Services and Construction Act.

Tournament of Roses, Pasadena, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix today for the benefit of my colleagues, the column by Mr. Ed Delaney concerning the traditional New Year's Day Rose Parade in Pasadena, which appeared in the January 10, 1966, issue of the Valley Times. It is as follows:

TOURNAMENT OF ROSES, PASADENA, CALIF.

There is still hope for the Nation. The traditional New Year's Day Rose Parade in Pasadena served to reassure us. It is Americana—particularly Western Americana at its colorful and cultural best. This year's event, perhaps all unintentionally, seemed to leave with us a most hopeful impression—that of American youth as they really are and not as a segment of them throughout the Nation would have us believe is the pattern for posterity to record.

In recent years we have been surfeited with scenes of unkempt, ill-mannered, grotesquely dressed and obviously intellectually adolescent individuals who clutter up college campuses and get themselves photographed in "rights" parades that are often wrong. Those specimens of mentally arrested humanity—because of the undue publicity given them—have given a bad name to the millions of youths who undoubtedly detest the zany, noddy-nonny nondescripts for what they really are.

It seems that this year's parade had an unusually large number of fine, alert, smiling, tastefully attired and enthusiastic young men and women who could almost cause the whole event to be called Youth on Parade. It was a delightful treat to see the real young America. They were the very antithesis of the synthetic Greenwich Village breed of creeps of both genders, and their Hollywood counterparts, who get themselves into news pictures and in miles of TV films that add to the boredom of the viewers.

Those hundreds and thousands of healthy and happy young people in the Rose Parade were, for the most part, from sections of this country that the supercilious egoists in those older settlements along the Atlantic coast disdainfully refer to as the "hinterland." Thank Heaven. It distinguishes them from the borderline specimens who have been successfully projecting themselves into the limelight.

Our State Department and the nabobs in Washington who determine the type of "cultural" displays and entertainment the United States should send abroad, can find nothing comparable to a film of the entire Pasadena parade. Send that to the unsanitary and often unappreciative parts of the world. It would be far more entertaining and educational than a covey of clarinetists, a bevy of ballet dancers or a motley array of Hollywood's part-time performers in something of dubious merit.

Nothing that is spawned in New York, Paris, London or any other part of the world even approximates the Rose Parade in imaginative creations, floral beauty, or artistic design. Having seen many of the "arty" exhibitions on five continents and both hemispheres for nearly 40 years, my vote for highest award must go to the designers of Pasadena's annual carnival of color.

Let the people on both sides of the Iron Curtain see this evidence of America's artistic achievement. Perhaps then the viewers will not put much credence in the Communist canard that the capitalist United States is a warmonger intent on building only missiles of destruction, instead of floral displays.

Although it was the glow of exuberant youth that seemed to permeate this year's parade, the older generation also rated high honors. The fathers and mothers who rode expensively saddled horses kept alive the colorful history of the Old West. But it was the boys and girls, the young men and women from California, Colorado, Arizona, Iowa, Montana, Nebraska, and other parts of the country who presented us with a new look. The marching bands, the seemingly indefatigable majorettes, the musicians and corps of young folk of the right kind, hold out a hope for future generations. God bless 'em.

Testimonial Dinner to the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., of Point Pleasant Beach, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a few days ago the Honorable Julius Foster, Jr., of Point Pleasant Beach, N.J., was honored at a dinner on the occasion of his retirement as tax collector in the borough of Bay Head. This was an unusual tribute on several counts, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a copy of the release announcing the event and the text of a telegram I sent to him.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONIAL DINNER TO HON. JULIUS FOSTER, JR., CARE OF BEACON MANOR HOTEL, POINT PLEASANT BEACH, N.J.

I wish I could be with you tonight as you gather in tribute to Julius Foster, who is retiring after 64 years as tax collector in the Borough of Bay Head. There is no question but that Mr. Foster has achieved some kind of record for longevity in a post that might have made any other person holding it very unpopular with fellow townsmen. Mr. Foster has managed to extract "Caesar's due" from the citizens of Bay Head in steadily increasing amounts over the decades he has served as tax collector without any ensuing loss of friendships. The salute to him this evening is an indication of the esteem and affection in which he is held by fellow residents. I can only wish for him many more years of satisfaction and happiness, surrounded by the friends and neighbors who have come to mean so much in the life of this public-spirited individual.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

BAY HEAD, N.J.—The man who has made a business of collecting money during working hours longer than anybody else in the United States is calling it quits the first of the year.

Julius Foster, Jr., tax collector in the Borough of Bay Head since 1900, resigns the end of this year with the longest record in the Nation of continuous service as a municipal tax collector.

Foster, 88 years old, will be honored for his 64 years in office at a testimonial dinner given Saturday, January 8, 1966, by the official family of the borough and friends and relatives, at the Beacon Manor Hotel, Point Pleasant Beach.

Having collected millions of dollars during his career, Foster surpasses the previous record of 57 years in office, held by a fellow New Jerseyite, Walter C. Black, tax collector of East Windsor Township, who retired in 1959.

The business of collecting taxes in Bay Head has increased many times since Foster took office on May 7, 1900. In his first year, he took in a total of $5,005 in tax dollars; in 1965, he collected $455,348.17.

When he first got the job, he was told it was temporary "until someone permanent can be found to do the work." He was appointed to complete the unexpired term of his grandfather, Daniel T. Staniford, who moved out of the town to Brielle, N.J. In 1901, Foster was elected by fellow townsmen, a habit which was continued by the three following generations. He can't remember when anybody opposed him at the polls. "Surely, nobody ran against me seriously," he recalls.

Oldtimers here remember that Foster's father was tax assessor when his son became collector. The family team conducted the borough's tax business for more than a quarter century, from 1900 to 1927 when Julius Foster, Sr., died.

During his 64 years as tax collector, Foster took care of his full-time job without extra help.

The next few days, before the year's end and retirement, he will rise as usual at 6 a.m., putter around his home until 9 o'clock, and then spend his customary 6-hour day in the tax office in the Borough Hall.

Over 40 years, Foster was in the plumbing business here. He was one of the pioneers in Bay Head who designed and produced the borough's sewerage system, built in 1911 far ahead of other local municipalities. He is a charter member of the Bay Head Fire Department and served as its treasurer from 1936 to 1958.

Foster was never married. He lives today with two of his sisters, Miss Ruth C. Foster and Miss Esther Foster, in their home at 501 West Lake Avenue here. His brother, Samuel F. Foster, lives in Springfield, Mass., and another sister, Mrs. Roy F. Striffler, lives in Berkey, Ohio.

The veteran municipal official was born in Jackson Township in 1877, and moved to Bay Head early in his youth. He attended school here and in West Point Pleasant. When he was sworn in as tax collector for the first time, he recalls that Charles L. Clayton was mayor and John J. Forsythe was borough clerk.

In 1961, Foster was named senior tax collector of New Jersey and received honors given him by the Municipal Receivers, Tax Collectors and Treasurers Association at the annual meeting of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities.

Foster is a lifelong Republican. His record in office has been praised by Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, who plans to cite the veteran tax collector officially next month before the U.S. Senate.

Similar expressions of congratulations for Foster's achievements have come from the Federation of Tax Administrators, the International Association of Assessing Officers, and the National Institute of Municipal Clerks.

A special citation will be presented to Foster by the Ocean County Board of Chosen Freeholders.

In reminiscing about his early days in Bay Head, Foster said: "The Borough didn't amount to much in the way of houses around 1900 although it was a popular resort. When I first took over the collector's job, the total assessment was $215,000. The biggest place in town was the Bluff's Hotel on East Avenue. I guess it was built in 1898 or 1899, but it seems like it was always there.

"I was here during the blizzard of 1888. That was really something. We were snowed in for a week. There wasn't any train service from a Monday to a Friday. I think some of the drifts must have been 8 to 10 feet high."

When he moved here there were only 10 houses in the borough, he recalls. Most of them were summer homes, he said, and the now fully developed bayfront on Barnegat Bay was then "inhabited by mosquitoes."

Foster has a good word for his fellow townsmen as taxpayers. "Most of them pay their taxes with no trouble," he said. "And, besides, the law has a way of dealing with those who don't."

President Johnson's State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRENTISS WALKER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during the President's state of the Union message before this body, I was reminded of a Texas horsetrader, who brought horses into our community when I was a boy. He was always quick to tell you all about the horse's good qualities, but deliberately omitted the faults that might cause disaster later on.

Mr. Johnson told of all of the magnificent accomplishments of his so-called Great Society during 1965, and of the great period of prosperity that our country is supposed to be enjoying. But, there are some points of the so-called Great Society administration that Mr. Johnson did not mention in his annual report.

One of the many facts that he did not discuss was our Nation's cost of living. On two different occasions, once in July and again in December our cost of living jumped to all time highs. In telling how good our economy is, Mr. Johnson did not bring up anything about the condition of our gold reserves and how our gold stockpiles in Fort Knox reached a new record low this past summer. He did not tell us it was not the taxpayers but the "States' liabilities" that want home rule in the District of Columbia.

President Johnson asked Congress to take away the individual's freedom of choice, the freedom he has to choose whether or not he wants to join a labor union. He failed to mention that last year, the Supreme Court of our land, that applauded his every action, ruled that an individual could be a Communist and still be the head of a labor union in America. And, he forgot to tell us that strikes during 1 month alone last year, in the same unions we would be strengthening, put over 220,000 workers out of work.

President Johnson told us in his report how great our farm policy is, and how much better off the farmer is today than ever before. I have never seen the farmer making less profit and more dissatisfied than he is today. You heard nothing about how our farm debt has jumped up nearly 50 percent since 1961—or that our Department of Agriculture is spending more tax dollars to serve less farms today than ever before.

When he talked about Vietnam, President Johnson forgot to mention that combat casualties over there last year amounted to over 5,500 men—or that we had 1,365 servicemen killed in action. The bad thing about the so-called Great Society's Vietnam policy is that we are exactly where we were 1 year ago. He is still operating on the policy of containing and appeasing communism. We're still not winning in Vietnam, and he made no claim that we intend to win.

The five-point foreign policy as outlined in the state of the Union message expanded beyond reason our present policy of appeasement at the cost of the American taxpayer. At one point the President said "The fifth and most important principle of our foreign policy is support of national independence." But he made no mention whatsoever about why we haven't followed this policy with regard to Rhodesia—where we have done just the opposite.

In all of this, I come to one conclusion, it is not only what President Johnson said in his state of the Union message but what he did not say that is frightening to me.

After 1 year of the so-called Great Society, with the increases in crime, immorality, bitterness, and insecurity, I think the citizenship of our Nation will admit that our society is in worse shape now than ever before in the history of our Nation.

Job Corpsman's Mother Writes Christmas Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I received a letter from our very able commissioner of reclamation, Mr. Floyd Dominy, under date of January 11, 1966, enclosing a copy of an article from the Trinity Weekly Journal, of Weaverville, Calif., for December 23, 1965.

This article sets forth the text of the letter which a constituent of mine wrote to the Lewiston Job Corps Center.

The Lewiston Job Corps Center is maintained at the former construction camp for the Greater Trinity Unit of the Central Valley project near Weaverville.

In the letter, the woman comments on her son, a member of the Job Corps. Her family is poor and is unable to provide the necessary education for the boy. The letter speaks in understandably glowing terms of the improvements this boy has made in the Job Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Job Corpsman's Mother Writes Christmas Letter

Lewiston.—The mother of a Lewiston Job Corpsman has written an unusual Christmas greeting letter to the staff of the conservation center here.

John C. Schaumburg, director of the center, made public the contents of the letter because "this area deserves so much credit for the success of the center."

Following is the text of the letter (author's name withheld on request):

"To the Counselors and Staff Members of the Job Corps Conservation Center in Lewiston:

"Merry Christmas and a peaceful and better New Year. And thank you, and God bless you for what you have done for our son these past few months. We cannot praise the Job Corps enough because we know what has been done. We see the result.

NOTICE IMPROVEMENT

"Our son, who once couldn't write his own name, now writes to us. When we talk to him on the phone, we notice the improvement in his speech, his attitude toward his fellows, and we thank God for folks like you who care enough to help a boy whose parents could not help him financially and otherwise.

"We read recently that a critic said $6,000 a year per boy was being wasted on the Job Corps. But I say one boy who is reclaimed, educated, and started on his way will pay back to the U.S. Government this amount several times over in his lifetime.

"This is our hope for our son. We again say we cannot ever thank you folks enough. But we pray that God will bless your lives with every good thing. Our prayers and eternal gratitude are yours.

"God bless you all and a merry, merry Christmas."

The War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked consent to include in the Congressional Record the following editorial from the Daily Capital Journal, Pierre, S. Dak., which appeared this past week on the subject of poverty being a state of mind. I think it is so good I want all of the Members to have an opportunity to read it. The editorial is as follows:

The War on Poverty

Poverty is a state of mind.

It exists among people who have no hope or aspiration for tomorrow.

For the past year or more this country has been witnessing an attempt on the part of an army of social reformers under the command of Sargent Shriver to wage a "war on poverty" that is about as expensive and a lot more futile than the war in Vietnam.

It was Juvenal who wrote that "we all live in a state of ambitious poverty." There is certainly a growing conviction on the part of a lot of people in this country today that Juvenal was right, and that the real distinction to be made among people is in the nature of their ambitions rather than in the nature of their bank accounts.

Shortly after the close of World War II the late Gen. George C. Marshall, at that time Secretary of State, made a speech at Harvard University in which he proposed the principle that the people of the United States should help the people of Europe to help themselves. That proposition aroused much enthusiasm at home and abroad, and it resulted in the sending of some billions of dollars abroad. More important it did result in an astonishing recovery of the productive capacity of millions of Europeans.

Subsequently the original program unfortunately was corrupted into a political maginot line against communism which resulted in the squandering of many more billions of dollars in ratholes all over the world.

When the "war against poverty" was first announced by President Johnson the concept was one of helping Americans to help themselves. We do not know just how much has been spent in this war to date, but of one thing we are sure. That is that it has not been waged in a way to change the state of mind or to arouse ambition on the part of very many people.

The surest way to reduce the amount of poverty anywhere is to create new opportunities upon which hopeful or ambitious people may seize. The man who invents a better mousetrap does more to eliminate poverty than a dozen social workers attempting to teach people how to make ordinary or obsolete mousetraps.

Poverty can't be eliminated by distributing existing gold among people. But a lot of poverty could be eliminated by eliminating a tax on production of gold, and even more by permitting gold to be sold in an open market. There would be miners working who aren't working now.

New York University Establishes School of the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, indicative of the growing interest throughout the Nation in the arts is the establishment by the New York University of a school of the arts. This is the university's 15th major division and will be headed by Dean Robert W. Corrigan, formerly head of the drama department at the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an article from the December 1965, issue of the New York University Alumni News describing the new school of the arts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York University Alumni News, December 1965]

School of the Arts Established To Foster Creativity, Offer Professional Training

A school of the arts has been established by New York University, it was announced last month by President James M. Hester. The major aim of the new school will be twofold; to have a creative influence on professional standards in the performing and visual arts, and to offer professional training in the arts.

When all its activities are underway, the school will consist of an institute of the performing arts, with programs in theater and musical theater, an Institute of Film and Television and, ultimately, an Institute of the Visual Arts with programs in painting and sculpture.

Professional artists will serve as master teachers, working with the students in flexible programs of study that fit the special needs of developing artists. The students' training will involve professional-level performance through creative and performing opportunities within the school and, where appropriate, through liaison with professional performing groups outside.

TALENT ESSENTIAL

The primary criterion for admission to the school will be talent and evidence of professional promise. Undergraduate and graduate degree programs will be available, although students may also matriculate in nondegree certificate programs.

President Hester has appointed Dr. Robert W. Corrigan, former head of the drama department at Carnegie Institute of Technology, as dean of the school. Dr. Corrigan came to NYU in the summer of 1964 to serve as professor of dramatic literature.

The school of the arts will be the university's 15th major division. It will have its headquarters at the Washington Square center.

In the theater program, the first to begin operations, there are plans for a junior repertory company that will perform at the school for invitational audiences. A professional middle company will be drawn primarily from the NYU program and while continuing their training with master teachers, will present public performances of classic and modern plays, directed by distinguished directors from this country and abroad.

The members of the middle company will be drawn primarily from the NYU program and to a limited degree from other training programs throughout the country. In addition, liaison will be established with repertory companies across the country so that there will be a natural next step in the actor's professional development.

As a direct contribution to the New York theatrical community, the school plans to establish a theater center to be used by invited members of the profession—actors, directors, playwrights—for rehearsal, experimentation and discussion. Other programs are envisaged, including joint work with various educational theater programs in research and training; research, publications and public forums; hospitality to and benefit from visiting professionals from all over the world and public service.

The institute of the visual arts will include a training program for artists, usually 3 years long, and an apprentice program, in which students will work under master teachers and participate in major projects that the master teachers will undertake. It is hoped that these major projects will evolve in such areas as experimental work in light, color and motion; art created with and for architecture, and designs for the theater and films.

The master teacher concept is important to all programs of the school, for Dean Corrigan feels that it is essential for the growing artist to have constant and stimulating contact with distinguished professionals in the field.

URBAN ORIENTATION

"Creation of the new school of the arts is in keeping with New York University's urban orientation and its tradition of adopting new approaches to learning in the city," Dr. Hester said. "We shall draw upon New York

City's rich resources in the arts and, in turn, we shall seek to strengthen the arts at the highest professional level. I am enthusiastic about Dean Corrigan's fresh approach to one of the most important areas of our national life."

The structure and purposes of the school will differ in striking respects from those of other such schools across the country, said Dean Corrigan. "Until now our universities have failed to provide training in the arts that is in any way comparable to that given in the sciences and humanities," he said. "Unquestionably, the universities have played a vital role in educating audiences, but they have not trained very many students who, upon graduation, are equipped to begin the professional practice of their art."

He also pointed out that universities have not played their proper role of leadership in the arts. "College programs in medicine, law, and dentistry not only train students within a university; they direct students out into the professions that they both serve and lead," he said. "The same opportunity now presents itself to New York University in several areas of the arts and the mass media."

Accordingly, all programs in the arts at the new school will have a dual purpose: (1) to give the students thorough and practical professional training and (2) to help improve and reshape the standard of performance and repertoire in the profession.

The program of the institute of film and television will be directed primarily to persons who have an undergraduate degree or have attained some measure of professional experience. The emphasis of the institute will be in three areas: on training for the field; on management training, and on experimentation in the whole area of the relation of sound to image, with special attention to developments in both media theory and technology.

Centers are planned for the institute of the visual arts and the institute of film and television that will be analogous to the theater center. Each will have a place at the university where professionals in the field may meet to study, experiment, watch films or performances and share their ideas with their colleagues.

The first activity to get underway will be the training and degree program in theater, which will began in the fall of 1966. The institute of film and television is expected to start enrolling students in the fall of the following year.

Chad Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, Chad celebrated its Independence Day. I believe it appropriate for the House to take note of this fact and to extend its good wishes to the people of Chad.

Although facing extreme economic difficulties entailed by its landlocked position and its large desert area, the people of Chad have worked hard and efficiently to develop their economy. The country is self-sufficient in food production and exports have reached a new high.

Chad has played a responsible role not only as a member of the French community and as an associate member of the European Economic Community, but also through its participation in a number of United Nations activities.

On this day, let us offer the people of Chad our best wishes for continuing their successful development and our congratulations on their day of independence.

The State of Elbie Jay's Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are times when a newspaper column tells a story so clearly that an introduction or postscript when inserting it into the Record is unnecessary. I believe this to be the case on the article by Arthur Hoppe which appeared in Saturday's Evening Star and which I place in the Record at this point:

The State of Elbie Jay's Union

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another tee-vee visit with the rootin-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, who humbly enjoys nothin' more than a good, long rousin', drama-filled old-fashioned political speech. As long as it's his.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's just a-coming in the door, all happy and wrung out. That's his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, puttin' down her seed catalog to give him a hug.

Birdie Bird: "How did it go, dear?"

Elbie: "Why, it was the best speakin' I ever did attend. I told them Congressman right out what the state of the Union was and exactly what I planned to do with it. And they darn near brought down the ceiling with their roaring, shouting applause."

Birdie Bird: "Marvelous, dear. How did you do it?"

Elbie: "Well, I kind of warmed 'em up by telling them how I was going to cure the sick, enrich the poor, wipe out slums, clean up pollution, stop the population explosion, and bring world peace."

Birdie Bird: "That's nice, dear. And which of your points brought on the roaring, shouting ovation?"

Elbie: "When I told them I was going to let them run for Congress every 4 years, instead of every 2. My, it sure is nice to know those fellows feel deeply about something."

Birdie Bird (hesitantly): "Did you speak to them about—you know."

Elbie (frowning): "Yep, I told 'em again about how they'd only have to campaign every 4 years, so's they'd have something important to think about. And then I spoke right out on Vee-yet-nam. I told 'em how it was going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. And how all the things I'm going to do at home is going to cost us billions and billions of dollars, too. Then, just when all looked blackest, I told 'em not to worry 'cause I had a plan to finance the whole shebang."

Birdie Bird: "Of course you did, dear. But how?"

Elbie: "Why, by restoring the tax cut on long-distance telephone calls."

Birdie Bird (absently): "Yes, you explained that to me last year. If you cut taxes, that stimulates the economy and brings in more revenue. Oh, I'm sure cutting taxes on telephone calls will bring in just billions and billions."

Elbie (irritably): "No, this year, I'm going to restore the tax to bring in billions. You never did understand high finance."

Birdie Bird (baffled): "But if you cut taxes to raise more money and now you restore taxes to raise more money—really, Elbie, I don't see how anyone can have confidence in you."

Elbie (smiling foxily): "Confidentially, honey, I'm going to use the tax to beautify our highways."

Birdie Bird (clapping happily): "You're wonderful, dear. I have every confidence in you."

Elbie (with a wink): "I guess I just know how to appeal to folks. With one thing or another. And now, honey, shall we see if I'm on tee-vee? Or shall we just have a quiet family night and sit around looking at my scar?"

Tune in again, friends. And meantime, as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' granddaddy used to say: "Talk is cheap. So use plenty of it."

Jawaharlal Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the Denver Post, in its lead editorial several days ago presented a most fitting eulogy to Jawaharlal Nehru, the late Prime Minister of India.

In the belief that these words express the feelings of all Americans as to the loss that we too have suffered, I am inserting the editorial at this point in the Record.

Peace Was Shastri's Legacy

"No one could wish for a better colleague," said Jawaharlal Nehru of his close and loyal friend, Lal Bahadur Shastri.

These words were uttered by Nehru shortly before his death in 1964, and he made it abundantly clear that he wanted the slight, soft-spoken Brahmin to succeed him as leader of India's millions.

The Congress Party gave Shastri, who had won a reputation as a capable administrator, the opportunity.

For 19 months, Shastri taxed his frail health seeking to achieve the democratic, humane goals Nehru had set for India. Monumental problems at home and abroad thwarted most of his efforts.

Then when it appeared that Shastri had achieved new stature as a statesman, a heart attack Monday night took his life in the Russian city of Tashkent.

Shocking as his sudden loss is to the Indian people, it is fitting that Shastri's final legacy to them was peace.

Only hours before his death, he and Pakistan's President Mohammed Ayub Khan had reached an agreement—with significant prodding by Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin—to end hostilities between India and Pakistan.

The Tashkent pact did not solve the Kashmir conflict, which has brought considerable anguish to India and Pakistan, but it did reaffirm Shastri's deep conviction that international disputes must be settled at the conference table and not the battlefield.

Hopefully, India's new prime minister, Gulzarilal Nanda, can complete the mission of peace undertaken so energetically by Shastri.

President Johnson, who was to have conferred with Shastri in Washington in February, expressed well the feelings of most Americans over India's tragic loss:

"The world is a smaller place without him."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include my report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama for January 17, 1966:

PRESIDENT NOT QUITE SURE OF THE STATE OF THE UNION

The best summary of Lyndon Johnson's state of the Union message was that it was delivered and received with a complete lack of enthusiasm. It seemed the President himself did not quite believe what he was saying. It demonstrated a lack of imaginative leadership at a time when the Nation needs inspired leadership. It was just a replay of the same old tired tune of spend and tax, more Federal control over the States and the people, an a promise of a war in Vietnam that will "last for years."

ON VIETNAM

The biggest letdown for the American people was the failure of the President to offer any positive program for ending or winning the war in Vietnam. He seemed to be willing to let the Communists decide on how the war will be fought and on what terms it will be negotiated. He failed to explain why we refuse to cut off the supply lines of the enemy by blockading the Haiphong Harbor and the Mekong River. He has no plans, evidently, for bombing strategic military targets such as the two rail lines from Red China into North Vietnam where many tons of war materiel is coming into the country, missile bases, military airfields, military fuel dumps and oil depots or ammunition plants. He made no mention of the fact that he and his political advisers are tying the hands of the military which prevents action needed to end the war in the shortest possible time.

RENEWED ATTACK ON SOUTH

In the best Johnson demagogic style he promised new attacks on the South under the guise of civil rights legislation. The effort will now be directed toward control of the jury system. This is a most dangerous area to be made subject to Federal control because the whole foundation of our judicial system with its guarantees of a fair trial for anyone accused of a crime, rests with the right of the accused to be tried by a "jury of his peers" selected without prejudice and subject to no pressures. Now the President wants to invade the jury box by giving control of the selection of jurors to Nicholas Katzenbach.

ASSAULT ON OWNERSHIP OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

He made a direct assault on the ownership and control of private property by promising to push for legislation to give "the Federal Government power to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or renting of housing." In plain language this means "open housing," which only a year ago was rejected in California by a vote of the people. Under this program Robert Weaver, head of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Nicholas Katzenbach will tell you to whom you may sell or rent your house or who is going to live next door to you. This is not a racial question. It deprives any individual of his fundamental right to manage his own property and to choose his own neighbors.

ECONOMIC FIGURES JUGGLED

The President's announcement that the Federal deficit will be only $1.8 billion next year was met with amazed silence by both Democrats and Republicans. It was the general consensus of Members of Congress that this is a mere juggling of figures and a bookkeeping transaction. Planned expenditures for the poverty office alone will cause a greater actual deficit than the figure quoted by the President, and the cost of the war in Vietnam cannot even be estimated.

In promising to push for funds for rent subsidies, the President provides for another open-end raid on the Treasury. Operating under regulations laid down by Robert Weaver's new Department many Government agencies and boards are already planning to move poor families into better residential neighborhoods by renting single houses at the going rate and having the Government make up the difference in what a poor family can pay and the actual rent of the house. This is integration by economics.

PAVING WAY FOR ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

Suspicions were aroused by the President's proposal to demand an International Education Act for 1966 and an International Health Act for 1966 in which the United States will finance education and health on a worldwide basis before we have even implemented the programs passed last year to solve these problems in this country. The suspicion is that this program is advocated by the proponents of one-world government as a first step toward eliminating national sovereignty and placing authority in the hands of an international tribunal. Perhaps it was more than significant that the President used the term "supreme association" in referring to the United Nations. America has always placed its faith in the Supreme Being and our national life has been guided by an adherence to religious principles. Now it seems we are being moved in a subtle way to accept an organization of men as the "supreme" influence and inspiration by which we are to live.

GREAT SOCIETY PROMISES UNFULFILLED

The rosy promises of the President last year for achievement by his Great Society were exposed for what they are, empty promises. The much publicized war on poverty to date has been a failure. Although hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the taxpayers in the hope the poor would be helped, the sad truth is that most of the money has been wasted or has gone into the hands of a few selected and highly paid political appointees. The newspapers have been filled almost daily with stories of intradepartment squabbling, waste and corruption. The only solution the President offered in his state of the Union message was to expand the program, hire more political people, spend more money, encourage more indolence by enlarging the welfare programs. He offered no positive approach to unleashing the tremendous power of the private enterprise system which alone will provide the jobs, the wages, and the incentive to put an end to poverty.

ECONOMIC PERIL TO THE SOUTH

In several key areas the President threatens the economy of the South. His demand, under pressure by northern big city bosses, that State right-to-work laws be repealed, is a prime example. While talking out of one side of his mouth about "individual freedom" at the same time he calls for depriving the right of the workers of Alabama to decide for themselves whether or not they want to repeal these laws.

His demand for an increase in unemployment compensation and an increase in minimum wage is another move, according to the Chicago Daily News, for slowing down the movement of industry to the South. This will mean fewer jobs for our workers and greater unemployment. As the Chicago Daily News puts it: "There's more bad news for the South in the program of the 2d session of the 89th Congress. The Johnson administration is pushing three proposals that, if enacted, would seriously crimp the sales talk used by the South in recruiting new industry * * * this phase of the Great Society could inhibit the industrial growth rate of the South." The three proposals are repeal of 14(b), increase in minimum wages, and Federal standards for unemployment compensation.

A NEGATIVE MESSAGE

A disappointment in the message was that it was so completely negative. The President tried to tell us that we are enjoying the greatest prosperity ever and at the same time he said we must spend more millions on more welfare programs because our people are in such a poor and miserable situation. He made no mention of the promise that we would get more tax cuts—instead he asked that excise taxes which have been in effect only 2 weeks, be put back on. He ignored the inflation caused by big government spending which is robbing all of our citizens of the purchasing power of the dollars in their pockets. People do not have more money because a dollar buys so much less than it did a year ago when you go to the grocery store or when you buy shoes and clothes for your children.

America needs positive leadership to free up the tremendous forces of the private enterprise system. It was through the operation of this system with its incentives to get ahead that we reached this point in history where our people enjoy the highest rate of employment and the highest standard of living for more people than any other nation in the history of mankind. Lyndon Johnson has failed to provide the kind of leadership necessary to meet the dynamic challenges of the sixties. It is now up to the Republicans in Congress, supported by those in the other party who have faith in America and its people, to provide the positive programs we need. That will be the purpose of our party and my own purpose in the session of Congress which is just beginning.

The Late Honorable John Taber

SPEECH

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join today the other Members of this House and pay tribute to the memory of John Taber who served this Nation long and served this Nation most effectively for over 40 years.

Congressman Taber was one of the most respected Members of the House Appropriations Committee and he was also considered as one of the watchdogs of the U.S. Treasury.

Even after his retirement he continued to speak in defense of the ideas in which he believed so thoroughly.

His steadfastness, courage, integrity, and a deep sense of responsibility to the American taxpayer will always be remembered.

I extend my deepest and sincerest sympathy to the members of his family.

No Sweat, No Strain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is "open season" for editorial comments on the President's annual state of the Union message.

I have learned to look forward to the reaction and articulation of my friend James H. Gray, editor and publisher of the Albany (Ga.) Herald.

His recent front page comments entitled "No Sweat, No Strain," are helpful to a clear examination and evaluation. I heartily endorse them and share them with my colleagues:

NO SWEAT, NO STRAIN

President Johnson's report on the state of the Union before a joint House-Senate session ran along well-advertised lines. The main assertion was that the Nation's economy was so buoyant that the war in Vietnam could be efficiently waged the while the Great Society domestic program is pushed forward to new, lush grounds. This is a familiar sentiment that has about as many opponents as it does proponents; it advances the theory that judicious direction by the administration can "manage" an economy that seems to be heading into unwelcome areas of inflation. The Chief Executive has cast his lot with the economic "managers" on the basis that unless high Federal spending is maintained there may be an economic downturn, which could be the prolog to recession.

Disturbingly, Mr. Johnson is playing the political angle for all it is worth. It is an old axiom in politics that the boat should not be rocked in an election year. A dedicated practitioner of the art, the President has remembered this advice well. For whereas he summons the American people to the severe challenges abroad, demanding the best from all of us in the way of energy, resolve and patience, he hesitates to prescribe any belt tightening at home in order that heavy military commitments may be met without serious economic dislocation. Instead, he suggests that we can finance a comfortable Great Society and still be able to prosecute a war on the cheap. And as a sop to those who believe in the philosophy of "no sweat, no strain, and plenty of Federal handouts," he refuses even to talk frankly about the possibility of new taxes.

Displaying his customary fascination for devious routes to hidden goals, Mr. Johnson says now that he seeks only tax "adjustments," notably a reapplication of excise levies in some fields and a tinkering with the withholding process in others. In plain language, these "adjustments" represent tax hikes, but the President elects not to speak plainly, because Congress is understandably cool toward increased revenue measures in an election year. This objection is purely political on the one hand, but there do exist other important considerations, such as the diminishing confidence of the American people in the brains and honesty of the Great Society spenders.

Hence the prospect is for a continuing and probably swelling Treasury deficit while the Vietnam war is going full stride. That means more Government borrowing and a rising national debt for the current fiscal year, for the following year, and others succeeding. It is a truism that deficit financing, which Mr. Johnson says that he truly deplores, is the taproot of a monetary inflation, which Mr. Johnson also says that he truly deplores. Yet, presumably, we are to have our guns and butter in huge amounts without exercising any fiscal discipline.

So round and round we are to go apparently, and where we stop nobody knows—at least until election-year politics has been safely determined by the White House.

We will admit that the President's oratorical task of putting the heated up cold war and the Great Society prospects in an agreeable political frame was immense, more difficult and more elusive than that of a "hot war" leader like Roosevelt or Churchill. Those World War II chieftains were stirring total commitments from their people in a total military struggle. It was black and white, we or the enemy. But the cold war is a far different proposition. It is diffuse and shapeless. It is hard to make eloquence out of military necessities—especially with no immediate goal in sight. Undeniably, the drama is there, but we doubt that the father image of Lyndon, who decided to say much less than should have been said in this critical situation, made a first-class hit on America's emotions with the oversimplified observation that we are so strong that nothing can push us off our feet—not even politics as usual.

We feel that the President has failed to face reality. Most people distrust the Communists, fear a nuclear war and know in a general way that our country is in constant danger. But what the American people still do not know is what is being asked of them in everyday terms. They want to serve and help, but they do not know how. And Mr. Johnson, although citing some areas where public efforts must be made, never did spell out the sacrifices. They were only implied—and that is scarcely enough to meet the harsh needs of deteriorating world conditions.

JAMES H. GRAY, *Editor*.

Tribute to Hon. Herbert Bonner

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to join in tribute to our esteemed colleague, Hon. HERBERT BONNER, of the State of North Carolina.

Over the past 20 years during which Congressman BONNER served his constituents and his country so well, he earned the respect and admiration of us all.

His strength and quiet wit will long be remembered and will surely be missed by those of us who considered him a valued friend.

Having been brought up spending my summers on the shores of Long Island, where the sport of fishing was enjoyed by amateurs as well as professional sportsmen, I shared a common interest with Congressman BONNER. It was always a great pleasure for me to listen to his many fishing experiences.

I am sure the Outer Banks of the Carolina Coast will no longer be the same. The fisherman has gone to his eternal home.

Medicare Oath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to eliminate from the Medicare Act the provision that allegedly requires some 2 million elderly persons to sign a non-Communist affidavit before becoming eligible for hospital and medical benefits. I believe that HEW erred when it made such a regulation for it was not the intent of Congress that it do so. This administrative decision to require that all those elderly persons who qualify for medicare, but are presently uninsured under social security, railroad retirement, or civil service programs take such an oath, is not only erroneous, but absurd and humiliating to those who must take it.

Miss Inez Robb, the noted columnist, the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, and Mr. Frank J. Gorsler, of Cincinnati, all have, in the last few days, commented on this requirement. I would like to insert Mrs. Robb's column, an editorial from the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, and a portion of the letter Mr. Gorsler wrote to me. Mr. Gorsler's letter expresses the sentiments of many elderly citizens who are puzzled and shocked by the loyalty oath requirements. I ask that these documents be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, Dec. 23, 1965]

BEFORE THE ASPIRIN, A LOYALTY OATH

(By Inez Robb)

Over the ages the testimony of a great many senior citizens indicates that old age is hell. The late Somerset Maugham's testament to this is fresh in mind. And only a few weeks ago, on the occasion of his 81st birthday, another gallant oldster, Norman Thomas, indicated his agreement.

Now, in its majesty, the U.S. Government has added a new burden to the ordinary indignities and ills to which aging flesh is heir. Before that flesh can be hospitalized for treatment under the provisions of medicare, approximately 2 million senior citizens will have to sign a non-Communist pledge before receiving so much as an aspirin.

To protect this mighty Nation from the legions of the aged and the sick, crafty legislators wrote into medicare a joker requiring the signing of such a Communist disclaimer. Senior citizens who are not covered by social security or railroad retirement programs are the targets.

It is estimated there are about 2 million such oldsters, whose fighting days, one would presume, are over. There is even a fixed belief in this country that age leads to conservatism as night to day, as witness all those little old ladies in tennis shoes and the corporation prexies who support the John Birch Society.

However, if television hadn't invented the phrase, "don't be half-safe," certain Congressmen surely would have done so. Rather than be half-safe—with the possibility that even one old Communist, "sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything," be hospitalized via medicare—2 million oldsters, whose only crime is that they are 65 or over, must submit to the indignity of a non-Communist oath.

"When will we grow up in this country? When will be become adult enough to do away with such nonsense?"—questions asked, in turn, by Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, when questioned about the oath. "Why, at the end of their lives, harass senior citizens with such an oath? I see absolutely no necessity for it.

"No farmer is asked to sign a loyalty oath to get a crop loan; no small businessman is asked to sign a loyalty oath when he seeks financial help from the Government. And certainly the officers of no ship line are asked to sign such an oath when they seek and get a big ship subsidy."

The oath for oldsters reads as follows:

"I certify that I am not now, and during the last 12 months have not been, a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950, as amended, as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization."

A senior citizen, male or female, can without penalty, enjoy membership in the Ku Klux Klan, the American Nazi Party, the Minute Men, the John Birch Society, the Silver Hearts of America, the Circuit Riders, or support Dan Smoot, the Manion Forum, Billy James Hargis or Gen. Edwin A. Walker, all so far to right of center that they're out of the ball park.

With impunity, they can tape former President Dwight D. Eisenhower as a Communist sympathizer. They can be howling anti-Semites. They can be rabid racists. And no questions asked. Membership in such organizations listed above implies no lack of sound judgment in an elderly man or woman in need of a hospital bed.

[From the Cincinnati Post and Times-Star, Dec. 24, 1965]

Silly Medicare Oath

Among the lesser known provisions of the medicare law is one which, in effect, requires some 2 million persons to take a non-Communist oath before they are eligible for benefits.

Affected are those who don't qualify for regular social security or railroad payments. If they want medicare, they must certify that they do not belong to the Communist Party or certain other organizations ordered to register as subversive by the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The history of such oaths is that they (1) do not serve the purpose for which they are intended, and (2) do insult the integrity of the decent people who are required to sign them.

Few actual Communists are likely to be deterred from getting free medical benefits by the mere formality of having to sign a piece of paper. Many non-Communists, on the other hand, may feel it is degrading to be forced to swear their political beliefs before the Government will pay a hospital bill for them.

As Senator Javits, of New York, has pointed out, no such oath is required of farmers receiving crop payments, or those who get other forms of subsidy. Nor does the oath apply to members of the Ku Klux Klan or other groups which don't happen to be on the SACB list.

This is a silly requirement and should be repealed by Congress.

Comments of Mr. Frank J. Gorsler

I'm 65 years old, still employed, and have no plans for being relegated to a rocking chair in the immediate future but a couple of days before Christmas I applied for enrollment in the medicare plan. On the same day, I read Mrs. Robb's column. Now I'm not sure whether I want to enroll or not.

The clippings say that the oath will be required only of those not "covered" by or "qualified" for regular social security benefits. I'm not sure of the legal semantics and it may be that I am covered and/or qualified, even though I'm not receiving regular social security benefits.

But whether the requirement applies to me or not, I feel very strongly that this is bad law—if it really is the law—and I am puzzled as to why such a provision was included unless this was done by opponents who sought to make the law less acceptable. I would never take such an oath and therefore, if it is required, it would be foolish for me to pay even $3 per month into the plan.

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the opinions expressed in both the Robb article and the Cincinnati Post editorial, although I believe a stronger adjective than "silly" is warranted in the editorial heading. "Asinine" seems more fitting.

I consider such a provision in the law not only humiliating but also futile, discriminatory and even detrimental to the preservation of democratic processes in our society.

I think it's humiliating because it presumes that the loyalty of certain citizens who have lived 65 years is automatically suspect and therefore proof of loyalty is needed when they are in need of hospitalization or medical care—although in their vigorous years they could obtain various Government subsidies without such proof. Is the alternative to let them die in the streets or to provide other forms of assistance? I call it futile because I believe any person dedicated to the overthrow of the Government would certainly have no scruples about signing a statement that he was not disloyal, whereas many loyal citizens will, I believe, reject this indignity. It "straws the wheat and saves the chaff." It's discriminatory because it seems to apply only to some oldsters and to certain classes and organizations and, I think, it's detrimental because it seeks to force loyal citizens out of any "infiltrated" organization, leaving the disloyal in full control. I believe good citizens should stay in and fight to oust the disloyal from power. If the Congress were to become infiltrated, would you resign and abandon the Government to them?

Is such a provision really essential to the security of these United States or have those who drafted it merely lost faith in democratic processes?

I don't know who sits on the Subversive Activities Control Board now and I cannot foresee who will sit on it in the future. I don't know which organizations are now listed nor which some future Board may list. Conceivably, a future Board could be dominated by the Ku Klux Klan, the Nazis or the John Birch Society.

I fervently hope that this provision of the law can be repealed and that you will assist in its repeal if proposed.

The Late Hon. Herbert C. Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened and shocked when I learned that on November 7, 1965, the Honorable Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, died in Walter Reed Army Hospital here in Washington. I wish to join my many colleagues in sadly saluting the memory of a man who devoted 25 years of his life to serving the people of North Carolina and the United States.

For most of the 25 years Herb Bonner spent in the House of Representatives, and in his service on the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he fought to strengthen and stabilize this country's maritime industry. He believed as most of us do, that the merchant marine was, and is a vital part of America's strength. For a decade as chairman of that vital committee, he fought for improved safety regulations at sea and technological advancement throughout the industry. In fighting to strengthen the merchant marine, a fight that I wholeheartedly did and do support, Herbert C. Bonner was serving not only the great State of North Carolina, but all the people of this country. He shall be sorely missed.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy and condolence.

Not a Great Society for the Domestic Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil-producing industry, not only of Kansas, but other States as well, continues to face tremendous odds in its struggle for survival due to this administration's policy on importing foreign crude oil.

I am inserting in the Record an open letter to Secretary Udall and the Johnson administration which appeared in the January 2, 1966, issue of the Wichita Eagle Beacon. This letter calls attention to the administration's discriminatory policy affecting this industry and should be of interest to all Members who represent oil-producing areas.

An Open Letter to Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall and the Johnson Administration in Care of the Department of Interior, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Udall: For the second time, the foreign oil import proclamation has failed to grant any relief to the midcontinent oil producing industry. On the contrary, it has either increased the tide of foreign oil, or, as in December, has opened the doors for almost unlimited increases in the future.

This concerns more than a relatively few oil operators. It involves the basic economy of Kansas and a dozen midcontinent and Rocky Mountain States. It directly affects the lives of millions of people in thousands of small communities that have staked their futures on the just expectation of a stable if not expanding economy.

Your administration has considered the facts and figures in numerous hearings. The declining state of the domestic industry was demonstrated with undisputed facts.

Deliberately, then, your administration saw fit to interpret the welfare of the American people, their small businesses and their livelihood, in the terms laid down by a few giant oil companies. The fruits of an industry that would have meant bread and butter to American citizens in ordinary walks of life were diverted to increase the swollen profits of international profiteers. The same interests are profiting again by U.S. offshore production in the Gulf of Mexico that is absorbing most of the growth in demand.

No credit is due to your administration for the now rising demand for domestic crude. It was built on the ruination of a substantial portion of the small business economy in petroleum States and a subsequent collapse of production and reserves. Temporary demand will not reverse the declining trend. It but accents the prediction now being realized—

Unless the U.S. oil policy is modified to serve the minimum requirements of domestic industry, American oil reserves will vanish. U.S. citizens will then be exploited by international interests in times of peace, and they will be at the mercy of their enemies at each threat of war.

This message is sponsored by members of the Kansas independent oil producing industry.

Panelists Stress Need for Educational Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, with growing numbers of qualified high school graduates wanting to enter college, the need for more higher educational facilities becomes imperative, as well as the necessity of increased faculty salaries.

In New Jersey alone, 4,000 applicants were turned away by colleges last fall, because of a shortage of facilities. That problem is faced by virtually every State and the main obstacle is the same: insufficient funds.

The Higher Education Act of 1965, which I voted for, will provide some help to New Jersey. It will receive $11,949,000 in the 1966 fiscal year from this program, including $1,319,000 in educational opportunity grants.

Although this Federal aid is encouraging and appreciated, much more assistance is needed if the colleges and universities in our State are to provide the facilities required by high school graduates.

In connection with this vital and urgent goal, the Daily Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., sponsored its sixth annual Round Table Conference, with three university presidents and an industrial executive comprising a panel which discussed, "The Future of Higher Education in New Jersey."

The article, written by Frank Kelly, entitled, "Panelists Stress Need for Educational Funds," follows:

PANELISTS STRESS NEED FOR EDUCATIONAL FUNDS

(By Frank Kelly)

The ever-increasing need for funds to provide for the State's burgeoning college-student population was underscored repeatedly at the sixth annual Round Table Conference sponsored yesterday by the Home News.

So too was the urgency for stepped-up salary scales for college faculty members to put New Jersey institutions of higher education on equal footing with counterparts in other States in the recruiting battle for topflight teachers.

These needs, it was stressed, are both current and continuing.

From New Jersey homes there are 50,000 students attending colleges within the State, said Dr. James Hillier, vice president of RCA Laboratories.

Hillier, who dug deep into the complexities of the college education picture as a member of the Governor's Committee on New Jersey Higher Education, said expansion is planned to accommodate 2,000 more students annually.

"But by 1970, we'll need about 40,000 new spaces, and another 60,000 on top of that by 1975. The situation is so big, so serious, and we've fallen so far behind that we're just numbed by the problem. The population boom is here now and will be with us for years to come."

The research management expert said that as of today, higher education in the State is between $100 million and $150 million in arrears in capital facilities.

Pinpointing the problem as getting the public to recognize its responsibilities, Hillier asserted: "It bothers me. We're living in this tax-free paradise, while sponging on other States."

This was in reference to his earlier statement that besides the 50,000 New Jerseyans who are staying in the Garden State for their education, some 60,000 are seeking it at out-of-State institutions.

While he believes that New Jersey's elementary and secondary school programs are solid, Hillier said industries in this State suffer recruiting losses. Prospective employees, out of staters with children, go elsewhere when they view New Jersey's "spotty" higher education system.

UNWILLING LEGISLATURE

The conference moderator, James Kerney, Jr., publisher of the Trenton Times and a former member of the State tax policy commission, ascribed much of the lag in higher education aid to an unwilling legislature. He believes the public, conversely, "is more willing to be taxed in this area and others * * * where it wasn't 10 years ago."

By and large, the panel which also included Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers University; the Most Reverend John J. Dougherty, auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Newark and president of Seton Hall University, and Dr. Robert F. Goheen, Princeton University president, agreed with the recommendations of the Governor's committee for setting up a cabinet-level agency to wrestle with New Jersey's needs in higher education.

The committee, headed by Dr. Carroll V. Newsom, former president of New York University, urged revision of the current administrative structure—the State department of education and the State board of education.

Quality in higher education—how to insure it when involved with a large student body—was discussed by Gross.

He said paying attractive salaries to faculty members is a necessary condition but not an absolute assurance of top-caliber instructional quality.

Gross observed that at Rutgers (where 4,000 New Jerseyans were turned away last fall because the university was filled) the present student body was assembled "from the top down," based on secondary school records.

COULD ACCOMMODATE MORE

Such a competent collection of students has made teaching much easier, he continued, but this isn't doing the job State institutions should. He indicated there's an obligation to a much larger segment of New Jersey's youth—who could be accommodated if sufficient funds were forthcoming.

At present, he said, Douglass College probably draws its student population from the top 10 percent among high school student bodies; Rutgers, from the top 20 percent.

Gross spoke of the dual aim of a university: To aid students to gain knowledge in a particular field they have selected; and to instill an interest in culture. Anything less, he said, and the student winds up with "a truncated education."

He said too that class size is a prime consideration, that ideally faculties should be augmented at a ratio of 1 instructor for every increase of 12 in the student population tion. But, because of a lack of funds, it "doesn't work out."

Biggest roadblock barring better salaries for Rutgers instructors, Gross went on, is the current arrangement by which State board of education approval is essential for pay increments.

And, as the Governor's committee pointed out: Fixed by the State board, salary schedules for various academic ranks are the same at State (teachers') colleges, Rutgers and the Newark College of Engineering.

PRESIDENT HANDICAPPED

Pay for a new faculty member is set at the minimum figure stipulated for his academic rank. Thus, the school's president is under a severe handicap when negotiating with prospective faculty members.

Resultant inequities Gross cited included this one: State colleges in New Jersey compare favorably salarywise with those in other States but Rutgers lags substantially behind other States' universities.

Sounding the dilemma of the private institution was Bishop Dougherty. Reading from a report in a 1962 issue of the Seton Hall University alumni magazine, he said that from 1947 to 1962 a 104-percent increase in the student population occurred in public (tax-supported) institutions of higher education compared to only 29 percent in private (non-tax-supported) schools.

"In 1950, 50.7 percent of the Nation's students attended private colleges; in 1954, 44 percent; in 1961, 39 percent.

"Private institutions—the weaker ones—I conclude, will be priced right out of existence because of the competition (with public schools) based on caliber of students and caliber of faculties."

Bishop Dougherty asked: "Can we (private institutions) match instructors' salaries with those paid by public institution?" He echoed a Citizens Committee for Higher Education suggestion that a stipend be given to the student who prefers to attend a private college or university in New Jersey—a stipend in proportion to his needs to finance such attendance.

"We feel this would be a definite help * * * in aiding the balance between public and private institutions."

NEED MORE PROFESSIONALS

Principal dynamos in American society since World War I ended, said Goheen, have been science and technology. He spoke, too, of the Nation's swelling populace and resultant changes in the economy, the need for more professionally trained men and women—lawyers, doctors, welfare workers.

"There's a need today for a diversified multilevel system of education throughout the United States"—from the 2-year community college to postdoctorate degree programs.

Higher education in New Jersey, he declared, is "badly undernourished, lagging in planning and in opportunities available."

However, Goheen voiced a measure of optimism: I'm deeply impressed with the degree of concern expressed by leaders and by just plain, ordinary people all over the State. It gives me some hope that things will start to move to make up for some of these lags."

Referring to a report of the Citizens Committee for Higher Education, of which he's chairman, Goheen said of the group's urging of a 10-year capital construction program totaling $427 million by 1975: "This may seem way out of the ballpark. But it's just that we in New Jersey haven't known what the ballpark really is."

Twentieth Anniversary of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks of Mr. Ralph Feder, chairman of the Teaneck United Nations Committee which he made at the annual dinner sponsored by this organization. This dinner was held on October 23, 1965, at the Fairleigh Dickinson University in Rutherford, N.J.

It is my hope that the Members of this honorable body will take the few minutes time it requires to read these exceptionally well-phrased statements and will note that they have a very poignant meaning to us at this particular time.

The remarks of Mr. Feder follow:

Your excellency Ambassador Vinci, other distinguished guests on the dais and friends all of the United Nations:

For the third year it is my great privilege to welcome you to Teaneck's annual commemoration of the founding of the United Nations. Twenty years have elapsed since the hour of its birth, a blessed event, preceded by the pangs of a suffering humanity.

We are practical people. None of us is so naive as to imagine that the present is like that remote past, that the conditions of life today are exact duplicates of the situation in 1945. Two decades ago, life did not possess the revolutionary qualities it has today. The original 50 founding nations could not then have projected the quick demise of colonialism, and the proliferation of smaller nationalities in Africa and Asia, that would swell their membership to 117. Who then could have foretold the stumbling blocks yet to be encountered by nations whose national interests would conflict with world interests? Within 20 years, membership in the thermonuclear club has risen far beyond any expectations silently nursed in 1945. Nor have the years left us scarless, in the tragic and suddent deaths of devoted sons of the United Nations, who expended their lives in its service: Count Bernadotte, Dag Hammarskjold, America's Adlai Stevenson.

And, nontheless, we rejoice. Despite our awareness of frustrations, we celebrate tonight a birthday. The very fact that, despite the weaknesses that have bothered and continue to bedevil the U.N. we can still rejoice, tells us a great deal about ourselves, about the dimensions of our humanity, and about the U.N. itself. As the late President Kennedy said, "Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can, and save it we must, and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind."

To be able to enjoy a birthday, to be happy about someone's growing older, is a talent reserved for special kinds of people. For example, they are reasonable people, who have a capacity for enjoying the process of growth. Reasonable, or better, reasoning people, are those who rejoice at the birthday of the U.N. because they are convinced that each day of its presence brings us closer to the universal practice of reason, as the only way of overcoming tension among nations.

These are people who refuse to be victimized by fancy or myth. These birthday celebrants refuse to knuckle under the fantasy that only war can resolve national differences. They are people who have perceived the glorious vision that this globe is part of a different kind of creation, a creation founded upon a reasoned order, whose laws of physical balance approve and demand a similar balance in man himself, and in his dealings with other men.

Not only reasoning men, but freemen exult at this anniversary of the U.N. The enslaved and those who enslave others cannot exult. For them, every tomorrow dissolves into yesterday's pain and emptiness. For them life has no importance other than to dominate or to be dominated. But freemen can exult in life, for they know its value. They know the exultation of the life that chooses to live. Free Americans can rejoice in this birthday of an organization that seeks to foster the self-determination of people long oppressed. They see their own struggle to be free magnificiently reflected in the U.N.'s work, in releasing human potential for creativity all over the world. In this extension of mankind's dimension, they themselves grow in their own humanity.

"Thy youth shall see visions." Yes, the very best birthday partyers are not only the reasonable and the free, but, and especially, the very young at heart. Youth is happy about birthdays, because it has a capacity to dream and to plan and to fashion a better tomorrow. Very quickly in life, they detect injustice and inequity, and they have the audacity to demand that life be better, that there be an end to the things that dehumanize us.

We who tonight rejoice at the U.N.'s existence, are we not as young as they? Are we not still filled with the vision of 20 years ago? Next week our children will collect for UNICEF. They will do so because they know that other children starve in our world, that other children go naked in our world, that they are homeless and motherless and friendless under a gaping sky. If we can rejoice tonight, it is because, like them, we, too, are young and concerned and ashamed that other human beings are forced to lead substandard lives. We rejoice, because we see the dent that the U.N. has made in the wall of man's pain and suffering. We hail its unsung heroes, who have cured 37 million children of the yaws, and 11 million more of trachoma, and another million of leprosy. We rejoice for the U.N. teams that have protected 162 million people against tuberculosis, and lowered the incidence of malaria by over a hundred million people a year. We rejoice for those nameless men and women of the U.N. who have helped to find new homes and new lives for more than a million refugees.

Faith in reason, in freedom, in youthful idealism has made our Nation great, and helped create the U.N. It is our faith tonight. Let nothing, then, diminish our rejoicing at this birthday party.

Have We Stopped Losing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a Member of the House just back from a tour of southeast Asia told me the other day that there were reasons to doubt that McNamara was correct when he said last November that the United States had stopped losing the war in Vietnam.

Of course the Secretary of Defense has done more to confuse the American people as to the true situation in Vietnam than almost seems possible.

In 1962 he was quoted as saying he was tremendously encouraged. In October 1963 he gave as his judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965. And a month later in Honolulu, he announced that American troops would start being withdrawn before yearend.

On March 17, 1964, he said the situation could be significantly improved in the coming months. A few days later he repeated that the situation in South Vietnam had worsened.

In May, however, he reported excellent progress, but 1 day later told a congressional committee that anti-Vietcong efforts had deteriorated.

In February 1965 he summed up his views saying that the past year had brought some encouraging developments. Last November after a sixth visit, he told the press, as I said at the start, "We are no longer losing."

Mr. Speaker, let me get back to the statement of the Member of Congress whom I cited at the outset as telling me he had reasons to question that we have stopped losing the war. This was from a Congressman fresh back from southeast Asia.

Since I quoted this in a House speech recently, I have been pressed for further details.

I do not know the final answer, of course, but I am told Americans and that United States and South Vietnam forces hold less territory now than they did a year ago. In the past it has always been the practice to gage victory in war, on the basis of which force won and held territory.

However, it looks like ultimate defeat or victory in Vietnam will come, not on the battlefield, but rather at a peace conference. If this holds true, politics being what it is with the President and his party urgently needing a settlement before the next election, many people fear defeat could come at any time because Johnson and his advisers would sign on any terms. That is why I have so consistently called for all facts to be given to the American people. Otherwise, if the people are misinformed and confused, public opinion will have no bearing on the outcome, which could be disastrous.

A Congressman recently told the Wall Street Journal that the thing that scares him is the President signing his name to almost anything in order to get a settlement. My point is, no such thing will happen if the American people are told the full story because public opinion is a powerful influence.

Meanwhile, in spite of McNamara's statement that we have stopped losing the war, here are a few facts from Senator Mansfield's report which could contradict this.

> The Vietcong force in South Vietnam is double that of 3 years ago. Their strength is steadily increasing.
>
> Introduction of U.S. forces—

The report says—

> have blunted but not turned back the Vietcong drive. The lines remain drawn in South Vietnam in substantially the same pattern as when the United States increased its commitment.

The Mansfield report frankly admits that the war has expanded into Laos and is beginning to lap over the Cambodian border. Worst of all, it concludes that there are no grounds for optimism that the end is likely to be reached within the confines of South Vietnam or within the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, if these facts make it appear as though we have stopped losing, there is something wrong with my eyesight. Especially this opinion should be considered in the light of the fact that the Vietcong, as I have pointed out before, hold more territory today than they did a year ago. The picture is not bright and the people should know it.

Hon. Herbert Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Herbert Bonner the Nation has lost a wise and able statesman. But, more particularly, the American Merchant Marine has lost a champion and skilled architect. No man labored more or gave more unstintingly of himself on its behalf throughout almost three decades than did Herb Bonner.

The fast, modern greyhounds of the seas, which today carry the American flag to the farflung corners of the globe, stand in living tribute as a monument to the endeavors of this one man. These same ships, constructed as a result of the vision and foresight of Herbert Bonner, are today bridging the oceans to supply American troops in Vietnam. Seamen and American fighting men throughout the world owe a great debt to this man. Truly, one can say that memorials to his achievements are now in being throughout the world wherever American-flag merchant ships ply their trade.

But to me the death of Herb Bonner means much more. I have lost a warm and personal friend with whom I have labored side-by-side for more than 13 *years. He was a close confidant. He was* a man whose counsel I held in greatest respect. He was a man whom I grew to love more with each passing year.

Perhaps the English poet laureate, Robert Southy, best expressed my feelings when he said, and I *quote*:

> The loss of a friend is like that of a limb; time may heal the anguish of the wound, but the loss cannot be repaired.

To his devoted and gracious widow, Eva, I can only say that her sadness is shared by Herbert's legion of friends and admirers. Perhaps this fact will make her burden just a little easier to bear.

Remarks of Congressman William M. Tuck, Democrat, of Virginia, at the Annual Meeting of the Virginia Association of Soil and Water District Supervisors at Richmond, Va., January 11, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on last Tuesday, January 11, the Honorable William M. Tuck, of the Fifth District of Virginia, addressed the annual meeting of soil conservationists in Virginia and made a splendid address.

Congressman Tuck served as Governor of Virginia from 1946 until 1950 and has an intimate knowledge of the problems of water and soil conservation not only in our State but throughout the Nation. His remarks are so timely and so interesting that I would like to commend them to the reading of the Members of the House.

I take pleasure in inserting his address in the Record at this point:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER DISTRICT SUPERVISORS AT RICHMOND, VA., JANUARY 11, 1966

It is a pleasure to participate in your annual meeting, and to meet with you experts in the conservation and development of our land and water resources. There is nothing more basic to our economy and welfare than our natural resources. It is an inescapable fact that what we do with our natural resources will not only affect our social and economic welfare of today, but also pave the way for future developments.

Although I am not a conservation expert, I am well acquainted with the soil conservation movement. I am aware of the need for a technically sound conservation plan on all land, whether it is farmland or not. I am proud to say that my own farm is a better one for the use of the technical know-how that has been developed in the last 30 years.

I am not a stranger to the soil conservation movement in Virginia. I have followed it as a member of the general assembly, as Governor, and as a Member of Congress. I have noted with great interest the concern of the people of Virginia in our great land and water resources. I have seen interest in soil conservation grow through the expanded soil conservation district programs. I believe in these programs and have expressed my support of them in the Congress.

In Virginia, we have already come face to face with soil and water problems that every community faces today.

The rapid growth of population demands space for homes, industries, highways, schools and playgrounds, shopping centers, and recreation areas, as well as the water, sewage, and other facilities that must accompany this growth. While in Virginia the expansion is most noticeable near the large metropolitan areas like Washington, Norfolk, Richmond, Roanoke, and Petersburg, it is by no means confined to them. Practically every small city and town is experiencing this growth. The State is actively encouraging industry to move in. The highway system is being improved and linked into the interstate systems. Tourism is big business and is growing. State and local planning groups and commissions are working on long-range land-use plans. Health and sanitary agencies, county planning and zoning boards, housing developers, and county governing bodies are becoming aware that we need careful, long-term planning if we are to make the best use of our land and water.

Our internationally famed Dulles Airport in Virginia near Washington is a showcase for aviation industry. It is also a showcase for conservation and its part in developing land to protect a community during and after construction. It reflects credit on the work that soil conservation districts are doing, and the tremendous part they can and should plan in nonagricultural development of rural land. It is an example of teamwork between a soil conservation district and Federal agencies.

The Potomac River is another of our attractions. What is done on much of our northern Virginia land contributes either to the beauty and usefulness of this great river or to its pollution.

I know that the soil conservation districts within the Potomac River Basin have been working in the hope of making this stream a model of scenic and recreational values. I believe the work they are doing to keep the soil on the land is one of the important phases of our program to beautify the Potomac. Nearer Washington, urban development and other problems are going to haveto be dealt with also. I hope that you as experts in conservation and development of our land and water resources will make yourselves heard and be a part of the campaign to clean up this historic river that has the potential to provide beauty, pleasure, and relaxation to those who live nearby and to those who come from all over the world.

The Potomac River and the Dulles Airport are showcases that are open to view by visitors from far and wide. However, the conservation work that you are doing throughout Virginia is no less vital to the health of our natural resources, to the economy of the State, and to the welfare of its people.

Congress, since it set up the mechanism through which the soil conservation movement began over 30 years ago, has continued to add tools for use in resource conservation. It has supported sound conservation programs.

In this decade, the U.S. Congress has broadened the soil and water conservation program by new legislation and by amendments to the old.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act has been amended to strengthen the assistance available from the Federal Government in order to make the program more effective. A 1962 amendment provided for Federal assistance in developing public recreation facilities and water storage for future municipal or industrial use. The amendment enables local communities to make greater use of the multiple-purpose principle.

Fortunately, one resource can often be put to many uses. And when local people and public agencies work together, the results are far better than those obtained when development is piecemeal or through programs with single-purpose objectives.

Our growing population and the complexity of our economy are adding new dimensions to the problem of resource management in this Nation. There are more claimants for natural resources and resource products, and the result is conflict and competition. This increases the need for multiple use so that several needs can be satisfied from a given source. It creates the need for coordination so that waste and mismanagement can be prevented.

The small watershed program provides for the multiple-use concept and it adds some other highly important ingredients—local leadership, local coordination, and local participation. Undoubtedly the involvement of local people is the reason the program has been so effective.

Our Mountain Run watershed project in Culpeper County has gained nationwide attention since it was dedicated in 1961. I am very proud of it. It is an example of the economic benefits a community can obtain through a multiple-purpose project that provides a dependable water supply and overcomes the threat of flood damages.

I am told that, since the national small watershed program began, reservoirs that have been built, or that have been authorized, will provide water to more than 100 cities and towns ranging in population from a few hundred to about 70,000, and totaling over 624,000. Since the 1962 amendment, interest in including water supply in watershed projects has increased considerably.

Development of public recreation facilities in watershed projects has also been stepped up considerably since the 1962 amendment. I understand that recreation is included in 67 of the projects designed since 1962, and that they will provide over 4 million visitor-days of recreation annually when completed.

I am well pleased that Virginia has taken advantage of the provisions of these amendments. Ten of the 25 watershed projects you are installing are multiple purpose. Nine of them include municipal water supply and one of these also includes recreation. More than 100,500 people in Culpeper, Keysville, Madison, Staunton, Luray, Drakes Branch, Chatham, Louisa, and Mineral and in Albemarle and Augusta Counties will benefit from the water supplied from reservoirs in these projects.

During the calendar year 1965, congressional committees approved for operations 99 projects—the largest number in any 1 year since the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act was passed in 1954. About 65 percent of these projects were designed for municipal water supply, recreation, or agricultural water management, in addition to flood prevention.

For this fiscal year, the Congress has increased the watershed protection appropriation to relieve the backlog of worthy watershed projects that have been planned and are ready to move ahead.

The drought conditions in the eastern United States during the last 3 years has made us all more conscious of the need to plan carefully for water supply. It has generated interest in local water problems. It has also brought farm and nonfarm people together to work out long-term plans and come up with something that is beneficial to all segments of the community.

Demands for land and water are increasing so rapidly that only by this type of teamwork can the available resources satisfy the needs. There is just so much land and water. We have to make the best use of it. This requires careful planning. You are experts in the conservation field. Your experience, your know-how, is sorely needed in resource planning. I urge that your soil conservation district programs include plans to make the best use possible of land and water resources to enhance the economy of the entire community.

We cannot afford to waste water in our homes, in industry, or on our farms. We cannot afford to let good usable water run off to waste, eroding our farmlands, flooding our valleys, and silting up our reservoirs and waterways in the process.

In 1965, the Congress added other tools through which the Nation's water and other resource problems can be evaluated and relieved.

The Rural Water and Sanitation Facilities Act, for example, provides loans and grants to plan and construct community water supply and sanitation facilities in rural communities not in excess of 5,500 population.

The Water Quality Act provides for the establishment and enforcement of water quality standards for interstate streams. It increased Federal grants for construction of community sewage projects.

The Water Resources Planning Act provides for Federal and regional coordination of plans for water resources development. It authorized Federal matching grants for the States for development of water resource programs.

The Federal Water Projects Recreation Act provides uniform policies for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation in Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects.

Other legislation is aimed at creating more jobs and economic opportunities in hard-pressed areas through resource development. The Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act both provide for stepped up or expanded resource development activities.

The cropland adjustment program, aimed at removing surplus production, emphasizes shifting land into public benefit uses that also conserve soil and water to meet future needs. It also offers opportunity for landowners to receive increased payments if they open their land to the public for recreation uses such as fishing, hunting, hiking, and trapping.

Future legislation will continue to reflect the needs and wants of the people. It will reflect the changes of the time—changes in resource demands and conservation and development problems, expanded population, changes in land use, leisure time, and the affluency of the Nation.

I consider resource conservation and development an important part of making rural America a place of opportunity for all who dwell there. I consider it extremely worthy of support by the U.S. Congress, by State legislatures, by cities, and by counties, and by the people—all the people, for they are the beneficiaries.

This year the Congress increased Soil Conservation Service funds $9.5 million over last year. The SCS contribution to soil and water conservation activities in Virginia during fiscal year 1966 will amount to an estimated $4.5 million. This is more than double the 1960 figure.

The Virginia State Legislature appropriated $232,600 for soil and water conservation work in fiscal year 1966. This includes $93,075 for planning watershed projects and $14,520 for installing projects. It also includes $80,000 to help speed up completion of soil surveys in counties that have urban conservation problems or where problems are anticipated.

The value of local governmental contributions to help carry out the program of local soil conservation districts in Virginia for fiscal year 1966 is approximately $69,715.

One of the most important ingredients to the success of the conservation program is local financial support. As the conservation job becomes more complex, the State and local funds will need to be increased—not to take the place of Federal funds, but to supplement them or to extend their effectiveness.

Of the 25 million acres within the boundaries of the 31 soil conservation districts in Virginia, I note that basic conservation plans have been made on only 5.5 million acres. The plans have been fully carried out on only 2.4 million acres.

I realize that not as much technical help is available as needed. I know that Federal technical assistance in planning and applying conservation measures is limited. That is why government at all levels must give financial support to the conservation program. That is why I opposed the proposal before Congress last year that required farmers to pay part of the cost of the technical assistance that has been free from the Federal Government. I believe that it would curtail conservation work that benefits the farmers and the whole community. I believe that it would have set conservation back 30 years and have laid us wide open to future conservation problems.

The demands on our land and water resources in the next few decades will grow tremendously. To meet the requirements for food, for recreation, for industry, for places for an expanding population to live, work, and to go to school, for highways, reservoirs, forest products, will call for wise planning and efficient management of our resources. We will need to prevent erosion and flood damages to our valuable land. We will need to improve water resources, to prevent water shortages, and to avoid water waste.

I think we have an excellent team. There is no doubt that we can do it. But it will take the involvement of both land users and consumers, both rural and urban people. Only then will we be able to go full steam ahead.

Smiling Fortune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with thousands of young men being drafted, some destined to leave their wives and others their sweethearts for duty in distant lands, including Vietnam, the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star is well worth reprinting:

SMILING FORTUNE

The world may be a cynical old place, but now and then our faith is restored when fortune smiles in the right direction. On Patrick John Nugent, for example. Like many draft-age Americans, Pat faced a possibly long separation from his fiance—who happens to be the President's daughter, Luci. Fortunately, his basic training as an activated Air National Guardsman took place at a Texas Air Force base near the L.B.J. ranch. This allowed him to see Luci on weekends, and all was well.

But anxiety must have stalked the young couple. What happened when basic training was completed? What about those long 4 months remaining on Pat's military commitment? It was a dilemma, all right, but fate again intervened. By coincidence, Pat will spend the remainder of his active duty at Andrews Air Force Base. To be sure, Andrews is 10 long miles from the White House. A kinder fate would have assigned him to the White House heliport. But the Air Force managed to compensate for this cruelty by arranging for Pat to live off base when not on duty.

Some Congressmen have grumbled about the chain of coincidences which has kept Pat and Luci together. But this is the churlish viewpoint. We happen to believe it all came about quite by accident, with no pressures involved and no favoritism shown. We also believe in Santa Claus, the Easter Bunny, and the Great Pumpkin.

Educational Benefits for Our New Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, more than 21 years ago—on June 22, 1944—President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed into law one of our Nation's most successful acts of legislation: The GI bill of rights. Perhaps the most valuable and imaginative portions of this measure were its provisions for educational assistance. Among its beneficiaries are Members of this House, several Senators, Governors, and even Cabinet members. Those who took advantage of the GI bill of rights know personally its great worth; the benefits it afforded the Nation as a whole have been no less valuable, nor in any manner less dramatic.

The United States today possesses some 450,000 engineers; 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; 360,000 schoolteachers; and 150,000 scientists, educated with the assistance of the GI bill. It helped to finance the college expenses of 2.2 million veterans of World War II; moreover, it assisted 2.1 million GI's in paying for on-the-job training. A total of 7.8 million veterans benefited from the legislation. The quality of America, therefore, increased as almost a generation of its people was educated through the GI bill.

The total cost of this portion of the bill was unquestionably great: $13 billion. The cost has, however, already been paid in full as approximately $1 billion in tax revenues is gained annually from the increased earnings of those aided by the GI bill. The expense was, therefore, a well-justified loan to our own people—a wager on the future of our servicemen.

The GI bill enhanced the moral, as well as the material, condition of our country. It fulfilled a nationwide obligation to compensate servicemen for sacrifices on behalf of their Nation. It reemphasized our belief in the promise of our Nation's future. And, above all, it dramatized our faith in democratic values by expressing the primacy of our concern for the human quality of our citizens. It has been rightfully pointed out that the cost of this program can be counted in dollars, but there is no way to set a value on the far-reaching influence for good it has exerted in the course of our national life.

Unfortunately, the educational benefits under this act have been terminated for veterans who have served since 1955. A generation of veterans of the cold war, namely, those who have served during the past 11 years, are being deprived of the benefits of this inspired legislation. There is no reason in the world that this should be so.

As in the years of World War II, we are engaged in a protracted struggle with an alien, ruthless, and totalitarian ideology. Our servicemen in Vietnam today are fully as important as were those of 20 years ago. The battle they wage is equally as essential to the security of our Nation. Today's conflict demands from its participants what was required of the military of the Second World War: readiness to sacrifice one's life, if necessary, for the protection of our country.

Hundreds of Americans have died in South Vietnam in the last few years. American servicemen were killed in recent years in Panama, in the Dominican Republic, in Lebanon, and Berlin. In these and other places, our military has demonstrated its readiness to sacrifice their lives for our Nation. We are therefore as indebted to them as we were to the soldiers of World War II. We would be derelict in the fulfillment of our obligations were we to deprive them of the educational benefits of the GI bill to which they are rightfully entitled.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I introduce a bill to continue the educational provisions of the act of 1944. It is known as the Cold War Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act. An identical measure has been sponsored by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, and 38 other Members of the Senate. I urge that we in the Houes join our colleagues in the other body in renewing this imaginative, valuable, and eminently successful piece of legislation.

As a result of the benefits provided by the GI bill of rights, most of the veterans of World War II have been restored to the mainstream of the Nation's life and activities, they are better off in terms of health and education, they enjoy better housing and higher incomes than the nonveterans. It is no more than fair for the Nation to provide the same or similar benefits to those who have served in our Armed Forces in the past decade and those who are serving in Vietnam and will be the veterans of tomorrow. They must be given the same opportunity to acquire an education and specialized training that would not be otherwise available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I have obtained some interesting figures from the Veterans' Administration on the educational benefits as provided under the GI bill during the years it was in effect. They are as follows:

Seven million eight hundred thousand veterans took advantage of these provisions at a total cost of $13 billion: First, almost 2.2 million enrolled in colleges; second, 3.5 million enrolled in other schools; and third, 2.1 million received on-the-job training.

The following specialists were developed as a result of the opoprtunities furnished by the GI bill:

First, 450,000 engineers; second, 180,000 doctors, dentists, and nurses; third, 360,000 school teachers; fourth, 150,000 scientists; fifth, 243,000 accountants; sixth, 711,000 mechanics; seventh, 383,000 construction workers; eighth, 138,000 electricians; and ninth, 288,000 metal workers.

The Bureau of the Census reports that an extra $1 billion per year is gained in tax revenue due to the higher earning power of those educated through the GI bill. College graduates earn nearly twice as much in a lifetime as do graduates of high school.

Of the 5.5 million veterans of the Korean war, 2.3 million took advantage of this portion of the act.

Nonstatistical benefits of the GI bill, as analyzed in a study made in 1956 by a committee under Gen. Omar Bradley:

First. Economic effects: The GI bill helped to avoid the predicted postwar recession by increasing earning and purchasing power and by creating credit for capital investment.

Second. Political effects: The GI bill avoided economic, social, and therefore political postwar dislocations by assimilating military personnel into civilian life. Insofar as it created and fulfilled optimistic expectations of civilian life on the part of American servicemen, it aided the process of successful demobilization. The bill also created new sources of leadership.

Third. The bill paid a nationwide debt owed to the servicemen for their personal sacrifices on behalf of the country.

Fourth. The bill was a dramatic demonstration of democratic values as it represented an investment in human value.

WHY COVER COLD WAR VETERANS?

First. About 5 million military personnel are not covered by the GI bill. These are the men who have enlisted since the Korean war and are the so-called veterans of the cold war.

Second. Despite the fact that the United States is not officially at war, the same sacrifices are required of today's servicemen as were made by those in World War II and the Korean war. American soldiers have been killed in Vietnam and other places. The same is demanded of today's soldiers as was demanded in former times: that they be prepared to die for the sake of national security. It must also be remembered that only a small portion of the 11 million men who served in World War II saw action, but all received the benefits of the GI bill.

Third. As in the time of World War II, it is necessary that today's servicemen not be excluded from the benefits of civilian life. With the high educational requirements necessary for employment, it is especially necessary that veterans be afforded educational opportunities after their period of service.

Fourth. The GI bill should be extended to help remedy the inequities of the current selective service system.

The Late Honorable John Taber

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the Honorable John Taber, of New York. I knew John Taber for almost 20 of the 40 years he served here in this House. I particularly came to know him through my service on the House Committee on Appropriations of which he was a member of 39 years. While I must admit that on many an occasion, we differed markedly on policy, I must at the same time salute his lifetime goal—efficient and economic Government for the benefit of the taxpayers and country as a whole. In the years that I had the honor of serving with John Taber on the Appropriations Committee, I also came to know him not as the gruff, angry man as the press so often likes to depict what it calls congressional "watchdogs," but rather as a fine, warm friendly, and considerate man.

When John Taber resigned from the House of Representatives in 1962 after 40 years of service, the loss was felt not only by the people of his district in New York, but by every Member of this body—regardless of which side of the aisle he occupied.

I have lost a firm, true and respected friend in the passing of John Taber.

Mother Asks Why Great Society Favors Dropouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be from the Volunteer State and especially happy to represent citizens who do not sit by idly and silently as time marches on. My people are proud and they are fearless, never afraid to voice their opinions on matters of the day.

I call the attention of my colleagues to two letters to the editor of the Knoxville Journal on January 8:

MOTHER ASKS WHY GREAT SOCIETY FAVORS DROPOUTS

As the mother of a serviceman overseas, I would like to know why the Great Society is so against the clean American boys, who finish school, many times by working long hours after school to help pay for it. The society sends them to some distant land to stop the Reds (so they say), then give the Reds all the freedom they want in America (here in Knoxville, too).

The service boy is paid less money (and he pays income and social security taxes out of it) than the dropouts and lawbreakers in the Job Corps. If he is lucky enough to get time off for a Christmas visit, he pays his own way. The society sure doesn't pay $2 million or $140 per person on the service boy's bus or plane fare.

Could it be that the ones who would put us under socialism, realize that first they would have to get rid of these honest American boys who prefer the challenges of life to the guaranteed existence; who would not trade their freedom for beneficence nor their dignity for a handout; who would not cower before any master, nor bend to any threat.

MRS. HELEN MITCHELL.

BLAMING RIOTS ON POVERTY DISGUSTS MOUNTAIN WOMAN

After viewing the Los Angeles riots on TV and hearing them blamed on poverty and poor housing makes me sick.

Those jokers have never seen any poverty, and I don't see how there can be any excuses made for people that go out to kill, loot, burn, and destroy other people's property.

I live in a community (near Wilder and Davidson) where there's no decent housing, no inside plumbing, and if you don't want to go underground and dig and load coal, there's no work.

Every morning we load our children on our 12-year-old school bus, send them to our drafty old schoolhouse, where there's no bathrooms, no furnaces, and nothing to play with.

Through the day the women carry coal and water, mind the young ones, and do their other daily chores.

The men go to the mines, wade water hip deep and work like men.

There's no Communists here, and we never have or never will have a riot or a demonstration.

If things get dull around here we just turn on our TV sets and watch the demonstations, and the poor poverty-stricken Negroes loot, burn and destroy, and holler "kill the whites."

It sure would be an awful thing to run short of antipoverty and welfare funds, they might have to go to work and earn their living.

So I hope all us good taxpayers keep up the good work, and pay your taxes, but keep your fingers crossed and hope the citizen of Watts, Los Angeles, and Harlem don't take a notion for split level homes, race horses, and swimming pools, or we've had it again.

Here on the mountain, the people had hopes of getting roads, housing, decent schools, and jobs, they got nothing. But I'm sure if all you welfare-drawing, looting, rioting poverty-stricken citizens will just be patient you'll get a raise in your welfare checks and more poverty funds than you've been promised.

DELLA MULLEN.

CRAWFORD.

Those Steel Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Arapahoe Herald, the weekly newspaper that serves Littleton, Colo., and, indeed, much of the 175,000 population in Arapahoe County in my district, editorialized on the Government's action during the recent steel price controversy.

The editor of this paper has been acclaimed as one of the outstanding weekly newspapermen in the Nation. Mr. Houstoun Waring does an outstanding job of keeping citizens of Arapahoe County informed not only of local matters, but often comments on national issues. I think he has performed a real service in the editorial which I am inserting at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Arapahoe Herald, Littleton, Colo., Jan. 11, 1966]

THOSE STEEL PRICES

In Truman's administration, Congress decided that it was the Federal Government's job to provide full employment and maintain the economic growth of the Nation.

This was a wise decision, and Uncle Sam has seen to it that America has surged forward. Moreover, he has kept inflation all these years at a lower level than any other industrial power—around 1.4 percent per annum.

This has been done only by pulling many strings, some of which annoy businessmen, labor, and the common citizen. In recent days, it was necessary for the Government to advise steel companies to stay within voluntary guidelines in raising prices.

Many people feel that the Government has no right to interfere with private enterprise. Property owners, they say, must be allowed to set their own prices.

This right is still theirs, but the great corporations don't wish to lose their biggest customer, who is that bearded man with the red-and-white striped pants. They also like his tariffs which make them competitive with foreign producers.

It is a fiction that our huge companies are operated by the owners. The industrial giants are run by a self-perpetuating group of insiders, and they are trustees of the same citizens who also choose the men in Washington.

These citizens don't have as much say-so about who directs the corporations as they do about who runs the Government. They are now getting proxies from the corporations for 1966 stockholders' meetings, and they have the chance of voting for a single slate of candidates—a slate chosen by the "ins."

Any stockholder that doesn't like the way his corporation is operated may stay at home and sulk. The last outsider to make his proxies count at a stockholders' meeting was John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who regained control of Standard of Indiana by soliciting proxies on his own account. To put in his executives, who would make needed reforms, he spent $800,000 to secure the necessary proxies and votes.

No one has offered a solution for this one-ticket situation in the big corporations, but none should cry about the Government's interfering with the decision of private ownership. The owners have had no voice for a half century.

It is regrettable that Uncle Sam needs to inject himself into the economy, but the moment he should step out of the picture this would cease to be the foremost nation on the face of the earth.

We now have a working partnership with big business, big labor, and big Government.

Under this system we have high employment, adequate national defense, minimum inflation, and the greatest corporate profits in history.

America's Airlines Today and in the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address by Mr. Leslie O. Barnes, president of Allegheny Airlines, before the Aero Club of Washington on November 30, 1965.

Entitled "1965—The Year of the Trigger," the address deals with the public-interest considerations of the airlines and it suggests certain actions to be taken by both the airlines and the Civil Aeronautics Board to improve service. The question of subsidies of the airlines is also discussed. In all, it is an interesting address and I am glad to bring it to the attention of my colleagues:

The Year of the Trigger—1965

(By Leslie O. Barnes, president of Allegheny Airlines)

Twenty years is a long time—especially when you're waiting for an airplane.

Now the airplane has arrived—$425 million worth of airplanes. This is the approximate cost of a reequipment program announced so far by 12 of the 13 regional, or local airlines in their conversion to turbine-powered aircraft.

The magnitude of this program is brought into sharp focus when you measure it against combined total assets of $181 million at the end of 1964, and a combined net worth of $56 million. Or, as a different point of measurement, consider that the total value of the Nation's trunk airline fleet, just prior to introduction of the Lockheed Electra, in December 1958, was $1,500 million. By contrast, the trunkline investment today exceeds $3,500 million.

These figures for our segment of the industry are causing uneasiness in some areas. Certainly they are thought provoking. But, as you contemplate the impact of this reequipment program on the future, you must first take a look at the past.

	Passengers carried	Ton-miles, mail	Ton-miles, express and freight
1945–54	9,947,711	5,375,518	10,523,960
1955–59	20,994,079	8,233,488	19,184,675
1959–64	40,634,866	18,017,117	56,121,188
20-year total	71,576,656	31,626,123	85,820,823

Will it shock you or cause any real surprise if I were to forecast that for the next 5-year period, commencing with 1965, our segment of the industry will carry more passengers, mail, express and freight than it did throughout its first 20 years?

Yet, without hesitation, I do this, I believe further that the Regional Airlines, as a group, will, over the next 5 years, carry over 100 million passengers, over 41 million ton-miles of mail, and nearly 200 million ton-miles of express and freight.

And since I have gone this far, let me add some additional elements of change which I believe to be as inevitable as day and night. I believe—

That we are on the threshold of a new era of certification for the regionals, with virtually no restrictions in the dense, short-haul markets;

That the regional carriers will be the dominant carrier in most of the dense, short-haul markets within their respective areas, and between areas;

That a new round of equipment interchange agreements is in the offing between regional and trunk airlines, and between regional airlines;

That these interchange agreements will involve both passenger carrying aircraft and freighters;

That there will be numerous agreements or contracts between the regional airlines and the Air Taxi operators; and

That there will be a definite movement toward consolidation of carriers which will more nearly conform to the natural boundaries of the Nation's principal marketing areas.

The year 1961 marked the start of a new growth cycle for the regionals with the adoption of class mail rate[1] I. The class mail rate represents stability and the ability to plan—a previously undreamed of respectability in the financial community. Truly, it was the most significant single action ever taken by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The equipment revolution now under way irrevocably commits us to the future. The year 1965 marks the beginning of a tremendous expansion, of our ability to develop new markets—to try new things—1965 is the year this new era was triggered.

Literally, the regionals' program has triggered the absolute necessity for rethinking old thoughts, for reshaping old policies, for revising old concepts. We must reexamine our role in the overall transportation picture; we must ask painful questions, and we must probe deeply into their answers.

We must start by reexamining our role in the overall scheme of things—not on an individual airline-by-airline basis at the outset, but on a national front. And we must do this with public interest considerations as the basis. If we do not do this, and do it thoroughly and honestly, then others will do it for us.

We must have the courage to spell out our role, and then have the stamina to fight for the implementing specifics of that role. We must dare to try new approaches, new experiments within our individual airlines as well as with other airlines—and we must be allowed and encouraged to experiment.

I have used the term regional in defining our class of carrier, and I believe the term to be descriptive of our role. All of Allegheny's planning and emphasis is bottomed on the philosophy—

That definite shifts in the Nation's primary marketing regions are occurring, and we must move in conformity to these movements.

That our role is to provide scheduled air transportation within one of those regions.

That it is the trunk airlines' primary role to provide scheduled air transportation between the regions.

Under this philosophy or concept, it must be made clear that the basic responsibility for providing scheduled air transportation to the smaller intermediate sized cities clearly remains on the shoulders of the regional airlines. Our equipment programs must be geared initially to the complete fulfillment of this responsibility.

The specter that somehow we will fail in this responsibility, or neglect our primary duty, has been and to some lesser extent remains a major deterrent to assigning the regionals operating rights in the more lucrative dense markets in our regions. Numerous warnings have been voiced to the effect that our equipment programs must include the smaller and marginal cities.

Allegheny's own program goes at least part way in meeting this responsibility. We have purchased ten 40-passenger F–27J's. These aircraft retire twelve 40-passenger Martins, and will give our smaller communities and markets modern, pressurized, turbine-powered air transportation. Because these aircraft will operate at lower cash costs than the Martins they replace, and because unquestionably these newer, faster aircraft will generate new business, we can provide more service to these cities at the same subsidy level, or the same service at less subsidy.

But at the risk of being misunderstood, the point must be made here that we are in business to make a profit. Where commercial revenues alone do not produce an acceptable profit, then to continue the loss services these revenues must be augmented by supplemental revenues from other sources. There are only two other sources—either from subsidy support, or profits from other routes and services. Thus, the quantum and quality of service to subsidy-requiring cities or markets, and therefore our continued dedication, must inevitably be bottomed on our ability to perform this function at a measurable and satisfactory profit.

But for the long run, our industry must be dedicated to reducing dependence on subsidy. This means that profits from stronger routes must be generated in order to help carry the burden of loss services. And I think this will be a healthy development for all concerned.

In this connection, I am keenly aware that from a public interest standpoint the Board must be satisfied that subsidy reduction as a result of such "cross subsidization" will not result in inadequate service to the smaller cities. Allegheny for one is willing to commit itself to a cooperative program with the Board to insure that adequate services are maintained. I'm sure the other local carriers will join in such a program.

It is obvious that at some point there is a practical limit to establishing this end of the service spectrum. Presently there exists the requirement to board at least 5 passengers per day, or 150 passengers per month, or risk losing scheduled services. This criterion or measurement has been questioned. Our long-time friend and advocate, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, pinpointed this concern when he said:

"I recognize the need to reevaluate the cities which should be served, and, in this connection, I do not believe we have adequate standards or accurate measurements to decide the difficult question as to which cities can justify continued service."

In this same speech[2] I think he provided at least part of the answer to this basic question of service to the smaller cities when he said:

In this same speech[3] I think he provided enough traffic to support service by F–27's, Convairs, or the new short-haul jets. But there are new, small, twin-engine aircraft available today, capable of carrying 6 to 10 passengers, which are being used for this very purpose in scheduled service by air taxi operators. More attention should be given to service with this type of aircraft, either through actual operation by local service carriers, or through contractual agreements with the many taxi operators in the country which already own these small aircraft."

It may well be that we are looking at the intermediate-sized airplane Senator MIKE was calling for in the Nord 262 recently introduced by Lake Central Airlines. The regional carriers, I am sure, will follow Lake Central's progress in this area with interest. But even beyond use of this size airplane by the regionals, we believe that there is and will be a natural and continuing affinity between the regional airlines and the air taxi operators. We have held and are holding discussions with some of them in our area.

I should emphasize here that any agreements growing out of these discussions will not be based on any abdication of our responsibilities; rather the agreements must be directed to tapping new markets and thus bringing new services to both presently certificated cities and to new cities not now certificated. I will have more to say on this subject at a later, more appropriate time.

I want to dispel the concern at both the congressional and Board level as to our interest and continued dedication to the smaller intermediate cities. Our discussions and objectives with the air taxi operators in our area and our purchase of the F–27 are evidence of this.

Four of these F–27J's go into service on December 1 of this year. The 10th one enters service in January. This 12th Martin liner will be retired on February 28. We will add additional F–27J's as requirements increase or new authorities are assigned to us.

Our first Douglas DC–9 will be delivered in May of next year and will enter service on July 1. This is the so-called series 10 aircraft with a 75-passenger capacity. It is a strange quirk, indeed, that this newest of all aircraft is to us an interim piece of equip-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

ment. It will be replaced only 8 months later by the larger, more productive 100-passenger DC-9 series 30 aircraft. By the end of 1967's first quarter, we will be operating three of these new aircraft. Others will follow throughout 1967 and the first half of 1968.

Looking back on our management deliberations on equipment selection, I think that the most difficult part was in deciding which jet to order—a really wonderful dilemma. We decided to risk loss of position—both in delivery lines and markets—by waiting until what we wanted was available. Both Douglas and Boeing came through. It would be inappropriate here to set forth the several factors controlling our selection of a jet. Delivery dates were, of course, a predominant factor in choosing between two very fine airplanes.

But, I must touch on one vital consideration which returns my comments to our concept of developments in the national picture and our role in it. I believe the next major breakthrough for our class of airlines will be the interchange of equipment at key transfer points between us and the trunk airlines.

An interchange, to be economically feasible, must utilize like equipment. To this extent we are still captives of our environment. To paraphrase an old axiom, "No airline is an island onto itself." Our final selection of the jet was therefore controlled by what we anticipated our larger neighboring brethren would do. It is not by accident that we have essentially the same equipment as that now ordered by Delta, Eastern, Northeast, and TWA.

We were concerned also that commitments to jet aircraft would have adverse political or community implications. But this concern was softened and ultimately submerged by the fact that we had developed our own "great society" in that our program gave each community service by modern aircraft according to that community's needs.

I come now to our selection of the Convair 580 as the touchstone of our equipment planning program. In a sense, this is our firstborn since we had to reach a conclusion on our basic workhorse first before proceeding to the respective ends of our equipment spectrum.

The selection of our middle-line aircraft was based upon two primary considerations: First, we reasoned that we could not afford a spare jet, and that we must obtain maximum utilization of those jets we did acquire. We reasoned further that there would be occasions when a jet would not operate and would be idle for unscheduled maintenance no matter how well it was built or maintained. Therefore, we must have other aircraft backing up the jet aircraft. Such aircraft must have a make-good speed approximately that of the jet, and it must produce maximum capacity as close as possible to the jet capacity. Secondly, over many of our segments, and in many of our markets, we have a requirement today and will continue to have a requirement for an intermediate-sized aircraft in the 50–60 passenger range.

The Convair 580 met both these requirements. In many of the markets where we will schedule jet flights, the Convair 580's block-to-block time will compare favorably with any jet time. Thus, the 580 will effectively function as a backup to the jet without tearing apart our on-time performance or reliability. It also meets our increasing requirements for capacity at many of our points and in many of our markets where we do not presently plan pure jet operations.

Two Convair 580's were introduced on June 1 of this year, a third went into service on August 1, and our fourth enters service tomorrow. No. 5 is scheduled on February 1, Nos. 6 and 7 on March 1. No. 10 will be in service by June. Thus, over the span of 12 months we will have 20 turbine-equipped aircraft in scheduled service. We will also be about halfway through out objective of being completely turbine equipped by the end of 1967.

I recite this particular background to our planning—not because I want to impress you with it, but more particularly because it is necessary background in those areas over which we have no control.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has the responsibility for developing a sound national air transportation system. Its decisions, the enunciation of policy as reflected in its decisions, and the enunciation of individual concepts and philosophies by Board members have a tremondous impact on airline planning and upon the investor and financial community, making possible realization of our plans.

Despite individual and beneficial route or service decisions, and despite the very real significance of permanent certification, I think that the adoption of the class rate by the Board on January 1, 1961, was unquestionably the turning point for the local service airlines. The development of the locals from that point forward has been nothing short of dramatic. This Board decision also has had a tremendous impact on our posture in the investor and financial community. By this decision alone we enjoy a posture of stability and respectability seemingly impossible only a few years ago. While further refinements in the class-rate formula can be expected, it is not anticipated that these refinements will have any adverse effect on the financial stability of the airlines.

I cannot know, of course, how many of you assembled here today have studied the remarks of the Honorable Charles S. Murphy before the Association of Local Transport Airlines on November 5, 1965. I have read and reread his remarks several times since first hearing them on that date. I urge you to do the same.

Without qualification, I think his remarks are a most clear enunciation of thoughts and beliefs. Of greater significance, his remarks tie together in a most learned fashion the extremely complex mix of factors running through equipment selection, route development, subsidy reduction, and profits.

I focused particularly, I think, on his discussions relating to the dense, short-haul markets. Let me quote a short paragraph as the basis for some remarks of my own on this subject. He said:

"It appears there are significant opportunities for strengthening your routes without undue risk to the welfare of our trunkline industry. Among the top 300 domestic markets, there are 101 markets under 300 miles in distance. These are markets for which your equipment and experience would appear especially adapted. Yet the total traffic in these 101 markets is less than 6 percent of the trunkline revenue passenger miles."

I have singled out this paragraph because it concentrates on an area vital to our own planning. These 101 markets under 300 miles in distance are the dense, short-haul markets to which I referred earlier. It is in these markets that real pioneering effort and concentration is required. Given the opportunity to do so, we will provide this effort and concentration.

The 6 percent referred to by the Chairman has other connotations. Less than 10 percent of trips in markets under 300 miles are by scheduled air carriers. And to drive the nail deeper, the highway—private automobiles—account for 72 percent of all trips between 200 and 500 miles, and 90 percent of trips in the 100- to 200-mile bracket.

The primary reason the regional carriers have had difficulty in obtaining certification in these markets or of having their operating restrictions lifted so they could serve the markets, is because the trunks are already there. Yet the 6 percent is, in turn, evidence that concentration on these markets does not exist today. In all too many cases the trunk certification serves only as "entry mileage" used to combine loads from two large population areas for a long-haul flight. A trunk to survive must maintain its competitive position and identity in the long-haul markets. For the most part it has little incentive or will to concentrate in the short-haul market. We will.

I don't know that anyone can specifically define what adequate service is. Most certainly unless a commuter type service is provided in these 101 markets, the market is not adequately served. The most graphic illustration of this is to be found in the Los Angeles-San Francisco, Washington-New York, and Boston-New York markets where real concentration has been given by the trunks in developing a commuter service.

Why shouldn't the same relative results be achieved in such markets as Baltimore-New York, Chicago-St. Louis, Seattle-Portland—to name only a few? Given adequate and frequent schedules, a fare structure and a service concept geared to attracting new customers—new air travelers—these 101 markets will double, triple, and even quadruple.

Our objective is not the 6 percent or the 10 percent—although given the opportunity we will get some of this. Our objective has been, and is, to dig deep into new markets; into the volume of people moving by surface means; or, more emphatically, those not moving at all. This is the real, long-term potential. But it takes the right to try it, the right equipment, maximum frequency, and a service tailored to compete—at least farewise—with surface transportation.

I have touched only briefly on the question of subsidy here today. Subsidy is both a complex and a simple matter—complex in its administration and simple in its purpose. But, it is not the alpha and the omega of our existence.

Nor is the $65 million of subsidy paid for scheduled air transportation to the smaller communities significant when measured against farm subsidies, maritime subsidies, docks and harbors subsidy, or a host of other subsidized national activities.

Over the past 3 years subsidy payments have leveled and are now declining. With each succeeding year since 1961 subsidy has become an increasingly smaller part of the regional's total gross revenues. How fast subsidy declines, both as a total sum and as a percentage of total gross, is entirely the product of first a continued congressional intent and desire to provide scheduled air transportation to subsidy-requiring cities, and second, our own ability to generate profits in other areas and from other services. In this latter area, the Civil Aeronautics Board alone holds the trump cards.

So long as we do the job assigned to us so long as we continue to hold our costs to a reasonable level, so long as what we do produces a reasonable profit for what we do, then we will maintain and where possible expand those services for which subsidy is paid. But, determination of the ultimate balance is not ours, beyond the simple forces of our willingness to serve and our ability to serve within this context.

All the ingredients are today present for maximizing the potential greatness of the Nation's air transportation system at all levels. We have yet to realize that potential—particularly at the middle and lower levels. But to realize these benefits we cannot be shackled to the past.

We must rethink old thoughts, we must reshape old policies, we must revise and update old concepts.

We are ready.

---

[1] This term refers to the formula which determines Federal payments, or "subsidy," to the regional airlines for providing air services at communities which do not produce sufficient revenues to cover the cost of serving them.

[2] Before the Association of Local Transport Airlines in Houston, Tex., on Nov. 5, 1965.

Castro Pushing Rice Fight With Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the continued mismanagement of our domestic farm economy by the administration, but the tragedy is compounded when we note the mismanagement of the farm economy in Vietnam in a fashion which is detrimental to our interests in that land. I refer to and insert in the RECORD at this point an article by economist Eliot Janeway appearing in this morning's Chicago Tribune, which tells of the mismanagement of the situation there by our State Department strategists.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 17, 1966]

POINT OF VIEW, JANEWAY: CASTRO PUSHING RICE FIGHT WITH RED CHINA

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, January 16.—For months, Castro has been nursing an exhibitionist's grievance against America. Our stand in Vietnam has stolen the spotlight from him. To get it back, he is picking a fight with Red China.

The war of words Castro has started with Peiping is about rice; that is, about the power which countries with rice wield over countries without it. Nothing is more fundamental for Cuba or for China and her neighbors on the Asiatic side of the Pacific than rice.

And now Castro is charging that big brother has welshed on his rice ration. Red China's defense is that she needs the rice, and if the subsistence of her enormous population is any criterion, she certainly does.

The upshot of this fraternal exchange of compliments is that suddenly rice has begun to run neck and neck with price controls as a problem story on the fringe of the headlines. Over in Vietnam, rice and price controls are no separate problem stories competing for occasional headlines when and as something pops and a big shot pops off.

CONTROLS ARE CENTRAL

Together, behind the headlines, day in and day out, price controls on rice are central to the problem itself; to the instability of the social structure within the rice bowl, and to our confusion of political purpose in trying to defend it. The combination of social instability and political futility is a sure-fire recipe for military frustration.

Believe it or not, we're experimenting with price controls on rice in war-torn, black-market-ridden Vietnam.

The amateurish price-control scheme we have devised for her rice traffic has doubled the movement and frittered away the energy it should produce. Not only is the Washington-imposed system of price control not helping the war effort in Vietnam, it is actually hurting. Here's how:

Vietnam is an underdeveloped country and, therefore, by definition, rural. Washington's principal worry all along has been that the people—meaning again by definition, the Vietnamese farm population—are not for the war and are not hospitable to our being in the country. But as the rice movement goes, so of necessity goes the loyalty of the farm population—that's the way cupboard loyalty works down on the farm. We've alienated it by slapping ceilings on the price the farmer can get in the cities, where our control is based.

CITIES GET BENEFIT

But the cities are getting the benefit of the huge dollar inflation we are pumping into the country. No boom town has ever had it so good as Saigon. Some of the dollars we are throwing around there must spill over onto anyone able to catch. Our own errors and failures leave no doubt that we cannot do well unless we enable the farm population to do well. Contrariwise, we must continue to do badly as long as our occupation gives the farmer the short end of the deal.

This is exactly what we are using our price-control system to do. As if Vietnam were an industrial miniature of America, we are relying on rice ceilings to protect the small population of the cities, which we already occupy, against the large population of the rice bowl, which is enemy country.

Our price controllers are giving the bargain buy to the cities, which are already cleaning up on our dollar; and they are making a present of the back country to the Vietcong, which is buying the farmer's rice and his loyalty with it—and no nonsense about price control. Worse still, the power in Asiatic power politics that goes with rice is now the Vietcong's by default.

ONCE RICE EXPORTER

For years on end, Vietnam was a rice exporter. She still is—though now the Vietcong has taken over the business and, indeed, is making money and building fences for itself as the silent partner of the farmer who refuses to settle for the "American" penalty price in Saigon. Consequently, Vietnam is now an importer as well. She must be in order to supply the price-controlled market.

It's our scheme, and we're paying for it. America is now shipping nearly as much rice into Vietnam as she used to ship out. Little wonder that the harbor at Saigon is hopelessly bottle necked for military traffic, and presents a ripe target for enemy counterbombing.

Four Columns by Art Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks and extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to insert four columns by Art Hoppe which were printed in the San Francisco Chronicle as well as some of the other papers throughout the country. Art Hoppe still ranks tops in the field of satire and from letters which I receive from readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they look forward to my inserts of certain of his columns from time to time. These columns follow:

GREETINGS, TAX FANS

"Ah," said the kindly old philosopher, "the humility of Thanksgiving; the joyousness of Christmas, the promise of the New Year and now, like always, I got my season's greetings from Mr. Sheldon S. Cohen."

Who? "Mr. Cohen," said the kindly old philosopher, "is our cheery Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Come January, regular as elm blight, he writes us 'A Special Message to Taxpayers' on the front of our income tax forms. This year, he's done a bang-up job. I'll read it to you:

" 'Every year more than 60 million individuals demonstrate their faith in America by filing income tax returns. The season has rolled around again and we are sending you this package of forms and instructions to help you do this.' "

Gosh, I said, a chance to demonstrate our faith in America. "That's right, son. I get all choked up just thinking about it. 'Course," he said, hefting the 40 pages of forms and instructions, "I'd favor demonstrating it in more simple fashion."

Like how? "Like maybe a form with just two questions: '(1) How much did you take in last year, you lying rat?' and '(2) Where's our cut, or else?' "

But how unfair, I said. For after all, our income tax system is designed to bring out the best traits in us Americans such as charitable contributions.

"Right, son. Our benevolent Government smiles on us giving to poor folk as long, of course, as they belong to an officially-certified Government-approved, tax-deductible organization.

"And it also encourages us, thanks to the blessings of the depletion allowance, to own an oil well. Which is a right good thing. As any man who owns one will tell you. And a nation of generous oil well owners is a fine goal.

"On the other hand, the Government encourages us to be sick—sicker than 3 percent of line 9, page 1. In the face of the population explosion, it will also gladly knock off $600 for each new kid we have and at the same time reward us for being over 65.

"In addition, the Government in its wisdom will forgive us the interest on our debts, the sales tax we spend on all the froo-fra we got in debt buying, and every penny we put out in bribing customers with whiskey, wine, and dancing girls. And if'n we can somehow cling on to our property for more than 6 months, it's a long-term capital windfall.

"So you see, son, the trouble with the system is there ain't enough oil wells to go around. And the only alternative for the rest of us is to become sick, old, overbreeding, debt-ridden, spendthrift, corrupting misers."

Good heavens, I said, put that way, income taxes were ruining the country. I couldn't see why anybody paid them.

"It's faith in America, boy," said the kindly old philosopher, placing his kindly old hand over his kindly old heart. "Mr. Cohen never said a truer word. Us 60 million taxpayers file our returns 'cause we got faith particularly in the efficiency of our T-men, the incorruptibility of our Federal judges and the security of our penitentiaries."

Well, maybe so, I said. But wasn't there one good trait the income tax system brought out in us Americans?

"Yep," he said with a kindly old wink as he picked up his pencil and went to work. "Cleverness."

JUD JOAD'S CHOICE

"Won't you set a spell?" said Jud Joad to the Government man, who had dropped by the Joad's little shanty at Appalachia Corners. "Maude, fetch the chair."

"No thanks," said the Government man, "I just stopped by to say the Government's going to want you folks to play a larger role in the war effort this coming year."

"Well," said Jud proudly, "I been fighting poverty man and boy nigh on to 60 years. And I ain't a-going to quit now. You tell the President he can count on me and Maude here."

"Not the war on poverty," said the Government man. "The war in Vietnam. Frankly, Mr. Joad, it's putting a strain on our economy. And it looks as though we're all going to have to choose between guns or butter."

"Oh, Jud," cried Maude, clapping her hands. "Take the butter. Just think how nice it'd be to taste butter again."

"Now, now, Maude, don't rush me," said Jud. "If'n I had a gun, I might pot a rabbit or two and we could have a bit of meat."

"Now, just a minute," said the Government man.

"I reckon you're right, Jud," said Maude, frowning thoughtfully. "Take the gun. But, my it's hard to make choices about things. I'm right glad we don't have many to make."

"Please," said the Government man, "I was just using a figure of speech. We're going to send the guns to Vietnam."

"See, Jud," said Maude, "I told you to take the butter. We'll take the butter and thank you kindly."

"I'm sorry," said the Government man, "there isn't any butter. I was * * *."

"Whoa, there," said Jud. "First you take our gun and now you took our butter."

"Exactly," said the Government man. "That's what I'm trying to say. In order to support our fighting men in Vietnam, we're all going to have to give up things we want. Like butter. Naturally, the first thing the Government's thinking of cutting back on is the war on poverty. After all, we can't fight two wars at once."

"Nope, I guess not," said Jud.

"So we're going to have to ask you folks to make a few sacrifices this coming year. Do with a bit less. Tighten your belts. But it's for your country, your flag and our boys over there."

Jud squared his shoulders. "You tell the President he can count on us to do our part," he said. "Whichever war he wants to put first."

* * * * *

"It sure makes a man proud to serve his country," said Jud later over supper after the Government man had gone.

"And I was so proud of you, Jud," said Maude, reaching across the table to squeeze his hand. "Course, it don't seem fair somehow. I mean when it comes to doing without, they always seem to ask us poor folks first instead of the rich."

"Well, I don't know," said Jud philosophically, as he spread a little surplus lard on his grits. "You got to admit, Maude, when it comes to giving up butter, it's a sight easier for us than them."

HUBERT GOES AWAY TO COME BACK

It's time for another chapter in that nostalgic series, "Where Are They Now?" So let us ask ourselves as always, where now is that all-time great liberal, the beloved, the unforgettable Hubert Horatio Whatshisname?

Oh, there's joyous news today for the millions of fans who never lost faith in Whatshisname. For though he retired to the humble obscurity of the Vice-Presidency, he is now making a game comeback.

Not only has Mr. Johnson sent him abroad, which is where Vice Presidents go to make a name for themselves, but Newsweek reports he is studying a new PR analysis designed to revamp his image.

He must, it says, engage in more "physical action." Such as: "moving, traveling, visiting, climbing, worshipping, hunting, fishing, sailing, boating, hobbying, reading, studying, thinking, sitting, gazing, looking, working, shirt-sleeving, gardening, flying, and cooking." On a scheduled basis.

So what a busy, happy scene we can envision in the humble cottage at No. 7 Memory Lane (a dead end street). Muriel his loyal wife, is helping him pack.

Hubert (head bowed). Praise be to him from whom all blessings flow. And Mrs. Johnson, too.

Muriel (holding a watch). That takes care of worshiping. Now, let's see, you're going traveling, visiting, flying * * *.

Hubert. As I sit here in my shirt sleeves, gazing and looking at Mr. Johnson's portrait, I cannot help thinking our beloved President——

Muriel. Oh, Hubert, stop talking.

Hubert (surprised). But that's my hobby.

Muriel (checking her schedule): I know dear, but it's time to start moving.

Hubert (jumping up and down). I get so excited when I realize how generous our wonderful President was to send me on this trip to such touchy trouble spots as Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. Oh, I sleep better just thinking of those extra glands in the White House.

Muriel. I think that's Mr. Valenti's line, dear.

Hubert. But imagine our President entrusting me with the job of handing out his very own initialed ballpoint pens in Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines. And he even said he didn't care how often I got my picture in the papers. In Japan, Korea, Taiwan, and the Philippines.

Muriel. Isn't there some other little trouble spot out there, dear?

Hubert. Well, there's Vietnam. Of course, it's not on my itinerary, but I've been saying so often lately what a wonderful war he's waging that he may relent and even let me go there. Incognito.

Muriel. Wonderful. Now, let's see, you've already been climbing, hunting, fishing, sailing, boating, reading, gardening, and cooking this morning. So that leaves just——

Hubert. I know. And I just want to say, friends, what a wonderful, marvelous President we have, whose wise, humane administra * * * adminis * * * admin * * *

Muriel. Oh, I was afraid of that. All this physical action has got you run down. Turn around, dear, and let me wind you up. Whatever would the President say if he learned you'd stopped working?

THE STATE OF ELBIE JAY'S UNION

Howdy there, folks. How y'all? Time for another teevee visit with the rootin'-tootin' Jay family, starring ol' Elbie Jay, who humbly enjoys nothin' more than a good, long rousin', drama-filled old fashioned political speech. As long as it's his.

As we join up with ol' Elbie today, he's just a-coming in the door, all happy and wrung out. That's his pretty wife, Birdie Bird, puttin' down her seed catalog to give him a hug.

Birdie Bird. How did it go, dear?

Elbie. Why, it was the best speakin' I ever did attend. I told them Congressmen right out what the state of the Union was and exactly what I planned to do with it. And they darn near brought down the ceiling with their roaring, shouting applause.

Birdie Bird. Marvelous, dear. How did you do it?

Elbie. Well, I kind of warmed 'em up by telling them how I was going to cure the sick, enrich the poor, wipe out slums, clean up pollution, stop the population explosion and bring world peace.

Birdie Bird. That's nice, dear, and which of your points brought on the roaring, shouting ovation?

Elbie. When I told them I was going to let them run for Congress every 4 years, instead of every 2. My, it sure is nice to know those fellows feel deeply about something.

Birdie Bird (hesitantly). Did you speak to them about—you know.

Elbie (frowning). Yep. I told 'em again about how they'd only have to campaign every 4 years, so's they'd have something important to think about. And then I spoke right out on Vee-yet-nam. I told 'em how it was going to cost us billions and billions of dollars. And how all the things I'm going to do at home is going to cost us billions and billions of dollars too. Then, just when all looked blackest, I told 'em not to worry 'cause I had a plan to finance the whole shebang.

Birdie Bird. Of course you did, dear. But how?

Elbie. Why, by restoring the tax cut on long-distance telephone calls.

Birdie Bird (absently)—Yes, you explained that to me last year. If you cut taxes, that stimulates the economy and brings in more revenue. Oh, I'm sure cutting taxes on telephone calls will bring in just billions and billions.

Elbie (irritably)—No, this year, I'm going to restore the tax to bring in billions. You never did understand high finance.

Birdie Bird (baffled)—But if you cut taxes to raise more money and now you restore taxes to raise more money—really Elbie, I don't see how anyone can have confidence in you.

Elbie (smiling foxily)—Confidentially, honey, I'm going to use the tax to beautify our highways.

Birdie Bird (clapping happily). You're wonderful, dear. I have every confidence in you.

Elbie (with a wink). I guess I just know how to appeal to folks. With one thing or another. And now, honey, shall we see if I'm on tee-vee? Or shall we just have a quiet family night and sit around looking at my scar?

Tune in again, friends. And meantime, as you mosey on down the trail of life, remember what Elbie's ol' Grandaddy used to say:

"Talk is cheap. So use plenty of it."

Vietnam—Neither Escalation Nor Withdrawal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, my visit to the battle zone in Vietnam in December convinced me that escalation of the conflict would give no more assurance of a successful end to the fighting than would an unconditional pullout by our forces. The Washington Post in an editorial January 16 said that "Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country."

Under leave to extend my remarks I ask that this editorial, entitled "After the Pause" be included at this point in the Record:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 16, 1966]

AFTER THE PAUSE

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the north while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any results. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the Executive Department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the north to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial targets that are peculiarly vulnerable to mass bombing. Even if the United States were indifferent to the moral arguments against mass bombing (and it is not indifferent), the practical results probably would not be any more decisive than were the results of area bombing in World War II. While stepped-up interdiction of communications might further diminish the ability of North Vietnam to give logistic support to a conventional military invasion, there is not much hope that it would stop infiltration of troops in small units. And even if the bombing succeeded in all these counts, the Chinese Communist support of North Vietnam might make the results indecisive. As long as air operations are directed at North Vietnam (and not China), we are embarked upon the task of kicking the cart until the horse cries for mercy.

The unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces is a course for which there is little responsible support in the country. And the primary reason is that no one can give any assurance that this policy would be any more successful as a means of ending the war in southeast Asia than the policy of escalating the conflict. Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country.

To continue or expand the present offensive against the Vietcong in the south, by the employment of the tactics now being pursued, is going to involve a heavier commitment than we have so far made if it is to have any reasonable prospect for success. Such an expanding commitment, accompanied by rising commitments of North Vietnam and China and Russia, might easily produce another stalemate at a higher level.

The facts of the situation seem to argue strongly for a somewhat different application of the military power we feel we can appropriately commit to the area. No doubt it is an alternative that already has been explored—and perhaps even rejected. But it can be argued quite persuasively that in the next phase of the war, the United States and its allies might wisely alter the character of the war in the direction of a more economical and efficient deployment. At present, we are engaged in an offensive-defense, employing both ground and air forces in the hot pursuit of Vietcong elements into terrain offering the greatest advantages of concealment and the most serious hazards to pursuing forces. To seek out and destroy a guerrilla force by such tactics, overwhelming force is required on a ratio of at least 10 to 1. The present ratio, counting all South Vietnam and American and allied forces is 826,000 to 230,000 according to the Mansfield report—and the rate of North Vietnam infiltration is on the order of 1,500 a month. So the possibility or feasibility of achieving antiguerrilla ratios like those in Malaysia and the Philippines is remote.

If it is difficult or impossible for us to annihilate the Vietcong without a military investment that looks excessive, it can be made impossible for the Vietcong to achieve their objectives without a deployment beyond their means. Were our tactics to alter from pursuit to a take-and-hold basis, the burden for the offensive could be shifted to the Vietcong. It is our purpose to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of national liberation, and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit. The American and South Vietnam forces, while steadily expanding the occupied areas and pushing out their defense perimeters, would be chiefly engaged in garrison operations. These, of course, are wasteful in terms of manpower employed but economical in terms of manpower expended. They are less hazardous and more feasible for a country in command of air power and thus able to maintain communications with scattered garrisons than they were for the French. Within the areas occupied by the South Vietnamese and by our forces, a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction could be pushed forward, once it becomes possible to afford the peasants and villagers security.

The military priorities under such a strategy would be (1) securing of areas already held, (2) expansion of that territory only as rapidly as we are prepared to take and hold new real estate, (3) pursuit operations only where they can be carried out with greatest economy of force, (4) air operations chiefly in close support of territorial enlargement, and, as indicated, against large and vulnerable enemy concentrations, (5) air interdiction of routes from the north, scaled to the degree of infiltration, (6) no air attack on North Vietnam for the time being or unless surveillance discloses massing for offensive operations against the south.

This is no quick and easy formula for an offensive military success in conventional military terms. It contemplates neither the annihilation of enemy forces, the crushing of the enemy's will to resist or the solid gains of invasion and quick occupation. It projects the steady, slow and patient pacification and reconstruction of South Vietnam. It must be acknowledged that success will consist of denying the victory of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in all the territory we are prepared to take and hold and then rebuilding that occupied area and providing the inhabitants with a higher standard of living. The forces required will be quite large; but the losses in combat should be much smaller with the defending forces enjoying the advantages of well-equipped men in strong defensive positions. It will cost more money; but it should cost fewer lives. It will take more time—but we should not be in a hurry.

Away from the combat areas, the strategy has the virtue of making it clear to the world that our role is purely defensive. The war in South Vietnam will come to a stop if the forces of the National Liberation Front quit their attacks. Every dispatch from the war areas will make it plain that it is the Communists who are responsible for loss of life and destruction of property. In the absence of negotiated peace there can be, under this formula, a tacit peace, whenever the Vietcong wish it.

This is no blueprint for either victory or peace in a hurry. But it is a blueprint that involves the surrender of no principle; it makes possible the deescalation of the conflict; it contemplates the confinement of the war to the area now involved. It does not have the simplicity of "victory" or "surrender." It plainly looks forward to an admittedly remote date when enough of the territory of South Vietnam will be secure so that there can be normal elections under which the people can pick a government of their own choice—and decide for themselves whether they wish to affiliate with North Vietnam or retain their independence.

The Valachi Memoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appeared in the January 9, 1966, edition of IL Progresso Italo-Americano, expressing the opinion that the Government should not give permission to publish the Valachi Memoirs. The views expressed in the editorial have long been my views on this very subject.

Under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent, I include herewith the editorial:

THE VALACHI MEMOIRS

Startling announcements out of Washington are not new these days. One expects the dramatic and the sensational out of the Nation's Capital which is the center of activity for the preservation of world peace, the crusade for civil rights, the war on poverty, and the promotion of human welfare, among other things. But we were nonplussed to learn that Joseph M. Valachi, the notorious gangster who told the Senate investigators a lurid tale of underworld activities and of the ramifications of the families dominating all segments of crime in America, has been given Government permission to publish his memoirs.

And what is the ostensible reason for this unique departure from an inflexible rule, since he is the first Federal prisoner known to receive permission from the Government to publish the story of his life of crime? A spokesman for the Department of Justice declares, presumably with a straight face, that the exception was made because Valachi's disclosures might alert the public to the crime syndicate's activities and benefit the law.

What a ridiculous and childish explanation. Were it not for the fact that those responsible are involved in the serious problem of crime detection and crime prevention, it would indeed be a laughable one. What on earth could be accomplished by permitting the public to buy a rehashed, if detailed, version of the disgusting "Valachi show" which the people of American watched on TV in 1963? We can just picture the great masses throughout the land queuing up to pay their hard earned money to read the story to recapture some detail they missed during the TV circus, and then run to the Justice Department with some tidbit which escaped those worthies.

"It was felt that Valachi's writing—declares Information Director Jack Rosenthal of the Justice Department—would bring out intelligence information beyond what he had recounted in interviews." This astounding revelation cannot possibly come to fruition. Joe Valachi has voluntarily given the authorities, according to their own version, the most exhaustive and imaginative account of the structure and modus operandi of the crime syndicate. He filled thousands of pages with his depositions and other information was elicited from him by the inquiring Senators at the TV hearings. What more can he add that would not be a repetition of the oft-repeated history of organized crime. Would it not be in keeping with traditional procedure to have the Valachi memoirs read by experienced Department of Justice agents—experienced in separating facts from fancy—rather than by the general public?

At any rate the original purpose of the Valachi hearing was to aid law enforcement. It is well known that Justice Department officials were disappointed at the reaction caused by the hoodlum's testimony at the TV hearings. They had hoped that public opinion would be outraged at Valachi's narration of the crime syndicate and its operations, but the public reaction apparently evaluated this performance as that of an unreliable small-fry gangster whose testimony was mostly hearsay and added little to the Department of Justice's knowledge of the crime syndicate.

Certainly no useful purpose can be served by the publication of this sordid material, unless it is solely aimed at perpetuating the kind of image of criminality associated with the many Italian names in Valachi's testimony, an image which the millions of law-abiding Americans of Italian origin have consistently proven false through their outstanding achievements in the arts, in the sciences, in industry, in labor, in the professions, in government, and in the religious orders.

We would like to see the Department of Justice scrap this infamous plan particularly in view of the record which shows that the House Appropriations Committee released testimony by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, to the effect that Valachi's disclosures had almost no effect on anticrime efforts.

This should be reason enough to ban the memoirs.

Truth in Packaging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the Record at this point a memorial that was unanimously passed in the Colorado House of Representatives, being sponsored by 48 of the 65 members of that body, of both political persuasions, requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt truth-in-packaging legislation. This action represents a strong plea by the people of Colorado, speaking through their elected representatives, that such legislation be adopted. The memorial follows:

House Memorial 1002

Whereas the purchase of packaged goods requires the spending of a substantial portion of the consumer's income; and

Whereas every Colorado housewife has the right to compare products, the right to compare prices, and the right to get what she pays for; and

Whereas, under modern packaging conditions, the consumer cannot see what is inside the package and she must rely upon the package to tell her the truth as to quantity and price; and

Whereas, under present law, a statement of quantity of package contents can be placed on the side, back, or top, rather than the front; and

Whereas the proliferation of packages in recent years has played havoc with our traditional system of weights and measures, through the use of odd fractional weights, and through the use of terms such as jumbo quart, full quart, and big 12 ounces; and

Whereas Colorado and nearly every other State in the Union has by statute or regulation established definite standards for weights and packaging of the sale of products from the producer to the wholesaler; and

Whereas Senator Philip Hart has introduced a truth-in-packaging bill designed to fortify the consumer in her right to be informed; and

Whereas such bill is designed to halt hidden weight statements, to authorize regulations establishing reasonable weights and quantities for retail sale, and to halt the use of confusing or misleading adjectives; and

Whereas, the bill is designed to stimulate honest competition on the basis of quality and price and to increase the consumer's real purchasing power by enabling her to make rational choices more easily; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado, That this house of representatives hereby petitions the Members of the Congress of the United States to propose and enact legislation in the Congress for truth-in-packaging; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Senator Philip Hart, and Members of the Congress from the State of Colorado.

Allen Dines,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Evelyn T. Davidson,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Don't Lie—Keep Silent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the people have a right to the truth from their public officials. If at any given time there is legitimate reason to withhold information, the Nation is not well served if distortions and lies are resorted to instead of silence. This is forcibly brought out in the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

Don't Lie—Keep Silent

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., a former Harvard University professor, a Pulitzer Prize winner in history, and a confidant of the Nation's highest officials, has admitted that he lied to a newspaperman in 1961 about the nature and size of the Cuban refugee landing in the Bay of Pigs.

This was a case in which the newspapers were used for a nonjournalistic purpose—it was, if you will, "news management"—and it takes a bit of explaining.

In his new book, "A Thousand Days," Schlesinger writes that the Central Intelligence Agency, as early as December 1960, abandoned its plans for a guerrilla operation against Fidel Castro in favor of an invasion that numbered 1,400 men.

At the time of the landings, however—as he now acknowledges—Schlesinger told a New York Times reporter in Washington that the landing force totaled no more than 200 to 300 men, and that the operation was not an "invasion" but an attempt to supply the Cuban underground. "This," he now says, "was the cover story. I apologize for having been involved in passing along the cover story."

Schlesinger himself, in December 1962, said in a speech that as a result of his participation in decisions in the White House, he could never "take the testimony of journalism in such matters seriously again."

"Their relation to reality," he said, "is often less than the shadows in Plato's cave."

If they are so, then the fault lies in part at least with Schlesinger and others who have deliberately misinformed the press. Newspapers are not perfect instruments of truth—they are fallible because like every other enterprise, they are run by fallible men. But more often than not they cannot be better than their sources of information. If men high in Government service lie to them, then the public is grievously misinformed, through no fault of the newspapers.

Obviously this game did not begin or end with Cuba. One remembers the misinformation fed the newspapers, and so the public, about former President Eisenhower's illness while he was in office, and one reads current evidence that military spokesmen are lying about operations in Vietnam in attempts to generate favorable reports from the field. Whatever their purpose or their immediate results in uplifted morale, such reports can in the end serve only to discredit the military and the newspapers and frustrate and anger the public.

There may be times, in days of great national peril, when the truth must be concealed. They are rare, however, and demand the greatest discretion on the part of those who do know the facts. In such times—and in lesser ones too—silence would be better than the lie. If they can't reveal the facts, let the officials remain silent.

Hawaii Stargazers Lose Services of Astronomer Edwin H. Bryan, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii's newspapers have been very successful in promoting the varied interests of its populace. They have been able to do this partly with the help of individuals who have unselfishly contributed their time and resources to the newspapers. One such person is Mr. Edwin H. Bryan, Jr., curator of collections at the Bishop Museum.

He has for 42 years prepared a monthly series of star notes and charts for the Advertiser and now for the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser. So widely accepted is his series that it has been referred to as the "Bible" of the stargazers in the Islands.

One of Honolulu's most respected scientists, Mr. Bryan not only achieved prominence as the author of "Stars Over Hawaii," but is also known as a botanist, entomologist, geographer, historian, and bibliographer. Underlying his diverse scientific interests are two basic goals to which he has directed his activities. One is to make science comprehensible to the layman, and the other is to make scientific data about the Pacific available to the rest of the world. A many of many interests, Mr. Bryan is also actively involved in the development and expansion of the Pacific Scientific Information Center.

Mr. Bryan has recently relinquished his job as editor of the monthly charts to Mr. George Bunton, astronomer and manager of the Kilolani Planetarium and Observatory at the Bishop Museum. He leaves with the blessings and gratitude, unexpressed though they may be, of his numerous reading fans. Hawaii's "stargazers" have indeed been fortunate to have had him for so many years.

The January 2, 1966 issue of the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser in Honolulu carried a story on Edwin H. Bryan's astronomical pursuits, which I submit for inclusion in the RECORD. The article follows:

FOR 42 YEARS HE MAPPED ISLE SKY

Edwin H. Bryan, Jr., curator of collections at the Bishop Museum, and one of Hawaii's foremost scientists, is retiring from an extracurricular public service that began 42 years ago.

Since 1922–23 Bryan has prepared for the Advertiser and later for the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, a series of star notes and charts that has appeared regularly each month.

The series was started as a result of Bryan's interest in astronomy—he was a charter member of the American Association of Variable Star Observers—and is today one of the oldest continuous features to be published by a newspaper in Hawaii.

The series is the "bible" of star-gazers in the islands.

Because of increasing pressure of other duties, Bryan has turned over preparation of the material to George Bunton, astronomer and manager of the popular Kilolani Planetarium and Observatory at the museum. Bunton's first star notes and chart appear today.

Those who know Bryan as an astronomer, through this series and through his popular booklet "Stars Over Hawaii," published in 1955, may be surprised to learn he is also known as botanist, entomologist, geographer—for whom maps and mapmaking hold an endless fascination—historian and bibliographer.

He was first associated with Bishop Museum in 1919 as part-time assistant in entomology.

Upon his graduation from the College of Hawaii (now the University of Hawaii) he turned to full-time work at the museum.

Although there have been many interruptions—studying at Yale and Stanford Universities, teaching at the Kamehameha Schools and at the University of Hawaii, serving in the U.S. Army, and participating actively on collecting and survey expeditions to many Pacific island groups—he is known as a man who thrives on multiple jobs.

In addition to his scientific publications and the articles and book reviews in various scientific journals, Bryan has contributed many articles to newspapers in Honolulu and other Pacific cities.

He assisted in organizing the First Pan-Pacific Scientific Congress held, in Honolulu in 1920. He is a member of the Hawaiian Academy of Science, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Explorer's Club, and many other local and national scientific organizations.

Although his scientific interests are widely diversified Bryan has nevertheless focused them on two main objectives: To make science comprehensible to readers of the popular press, and to make available to scientists all over the world the rapidly accumulating masses of data about Pacific geography, natural history, and the study of man in the Pacific.

In addition to his duties as curator of collections, beginning in 1927, Bryan has concentrated heavily in recent years on the development and expansion of the Pacific Scientific Information Center, which is supported in part by the National Science Foundation.

First organized in 1960 with an "office" consisting of a table and two chairs, the Center now occupies half of the ground floor of Paki Hall, one of Bishop Museum's research and office buildings.

South Jersey Troops in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. McGRATH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, during my Christmastime tour of Vietnamese fighting areas, I was fortunate in meeting a number of fighting men from several services. The high state of their morale and training, their understanding of their mission, their respect for the Vietnamese people, and their eagerness to do the job they are in Vietnam to do was, I found, typical of all the American military men—officers and enlisted men of all services—with whom I spoke while in Vietnam.

Therefore, I feel it might be of interest to my colleagues to read of the reactions of the soldiers, sailors, and marines from New Jersey's Second District, which I enumerated in a news release which I have sent to newspapers and radio stations in my district. The news release reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Servicemen from the Second District fighting in Vietnam, visited by Representative THOMAS C. McGRATH, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, at Christmastime, "were all in high spirits and grateful for letters of encouragement and gifts from the folks back home," the Congressman said upon his return here.

During his tour of the fighting areas last month, Representative McGRATH visited installations of the 1st Air Cavalry Division, the 3d Marine Division, the Rung Sat Special Zone River Attack Group, a special forces fort near the Cambodia border, flew with the Air Force, and went aboard the nuclear carrier USS *Enterprise* in the South China Sea.

"At each stop on my inspection tour I looked for men from Atlantic, Cape May, and Cumberland Counties, and did locate eight of them and narrowly missed two others, for whom I left messages," the Congressman said.

"Without exception, I found them all in fine health and at the peak of training, their morale was high, and they were, to a man, fully aware of the reasons they were in Vietnam and eager to do their part to end this terrible warfare against the Vietcong," Representative McGRATH declared.

Serving with 3d Marines at Chu Lai, the Congressman talked with Sgt. Larry Mullin, son of Mr. and Mrs. George Mullin of 124 East Edgewater Avenue, Pleasantville, and Sgt. William B. McLaughlin, son of Mrs. W. McLaughlin of 224 North Dudley Avenue, Ventnor, and husband of Mrs. Diane Gruhler McLaughlin of 520 Broad Street, Pleasantville.

Sergeant McLaughlin said that since his unit, the 4th Marine Regiment, landed at Chu Lai in early August, "we can see a definite improvement in the situation." Sergeant Mullin told the Congressman, "There's no question that we're doing a lot of good here."

Lt. Larry Letzer of 341 31st Street, South, Brigantine, had just arrived in Vietnam when he encountered Representative McGRATH at Tan Son Nhut Air Base near Saigon. Serving with a photo reconnaissance outfit, Lieutenant Letzer noted that he and all the other members of his unit had volunteered for duty in Vietnam. "It's a job that has to be done," he told his Congressman.

Aboard the *Enterprise*, Representative McGRATH met Aviation Machinist's Mate 2c James B. Hill, son of Mr. and Mrs. James S. Hill of 412 Mulberry Avenue, Pleasantville, who has been aboard the "Big E" for 2½ years and has been aboard the "Big E" for 2½ years and was spending his fourth consecutive Christmas season away from hime.

Attached to a reconnaissance attack squadron, Hill said "our morale has taken an upward turn in the past month or so, and we realize now that the draft card burners in the States are just a small group of immature adults."

Marine Pvt. G. M. Sorg, Jr., of 807 White Horse Pike, Egg Harbor, was on patrol when Representative McGRATH visited the 4th Marine Regiment at Chu Lai, but the traveling Congressman left a message for the home district fighting man.

Two Infantry sergeants from Cumberland County, both serving with the 1st Air Cavalry Division at An Khe, were awaiting Representative McGRATH when he arrived at that well-fortified enclave guarding Highway 19 from the coast to Pleiku.

Sgt. Frank C. Giordano, of 510 Oxford Street, Vineland, a squad leader in the 1st Platoon of C Company, 1st Battalion, had served 3 years with the Marines before joining the Army 3 years ago. He told his Congressman "there's plenty of fighting here, but it's not as bad as I'd imagined it would be."

Sgt. Paul J. Maines of Bridgeton, although he has no address there at present, is serving in C Company of the 3d Battalion, at An Khe. He told Representative McGRATH that "we're doing a job that must be done and getting it done the best we can."

"He told me he feels the main thing is to give the Vietnamese a chance to live the way we do," the Congressman recounted. "Sergeant Maines said he's sure the Vietnamese will build a great democracy and they're very curious about life in the States."

Another Vinelander, Marine Pvt. Eugene Lewis of 505 North Third Street, was on duty when Representative McGRATH toured the Chu Lai installation and, here, too, the Congressman left a message for the leatherneck.

Lt. Col. James D. Kennedy, son of Mrs. Irene E. Kennedy, of 1022 Maryland Avenue, Cape May City, was in Saigon on a supply mission for his special forces unit when Representative McGRATH met him. Colonel Kennedy is with an Army concept team, doing research and development work on concepts and equipment used by the special forces all over the fighting area.

"Jim said he thinks the military situation is improving in Vietnam, and the morale of the Army of Vietnam (ARVIN) forces has gone sky high recently due to military successes against the Cong," the Congressman said. "He added our own soldiers are learning how to fight this strange type of war, and the planning and crash work which has gone into better preparing U.S. forces for this kind of warfare amazes even an old soldier like him."

At Chu Lai, Representative McGRATH met Marine Pvt. G. A. Defero of 1400 West Glenwood, Wildwood, who serves with the 4th Marine Regiment. Defero told the Congressman many men in his unit have been receiving anonymous mail from antidraft people in the States and added many of his buddies would like to go to the States and tell them off.

"I was tremendously proud of the job the men from our district are doing in the various branches of the military service in which they're serving in Vietnam," Representative McGRATH said upon his return.

"As 'Christmas gifts,' I gave each of the fellows I met from home, and lots of other U.S. servicemen with whom I talked, ballpoint pens and urged them all to write home and tell their folks and friends just what the war is like in Vietnam and what we're attempting to do there. They know people stateside read a great deal about opposition to our involvement in Vietnam and I said they'd be happy to know the morale among our troops is so high. They all seemed eager to write home," Representative McGrath said.

"I was sorry I couldn't meet more of our second district fighting men, but at some of the installations I visited there were only a handful of American advisers, and none from our district among them.

"It struck me that if every American could see, as I saw, the conditions under which they're fighting, and learn first hand some of the civil complications and the psychological problems of the Vietnamese, our efforts to maintain the freedom of South Vietnam would have even greater support here," he added.

Representative McGrath visited Vietnam during the Christmas holidays at his own expense, and while there toured some of the U.S. installations in the midst of Vietcong territory. While leaving the special forces fortress at Minh Thanh, the helicopter carrying the Congressman sustained two rifle hits from Cong guns, narrowly escaping injury or worse.

"Compared to what our troops face every day and night, my close call was nothing," he said. "It only served to make me more proud and more appreciative of the job our men are doing there," he declared.

Testimonial to Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wausau Record-Herald in my congressional district, contained a timely and thought-provoking editorial on January 10, 1966, entiled "Testimonial to Opportunity," which should be of interest to every Member of this House.

The editorial deals with a letter written to the editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel by a Menominee Indian housewife and eloquently speaks for itself.

Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert the editorial, entitled "Testimonial to Opportunity," at this point in the Record:

Testimonial to Opportunity

Opportunity is omnipresent in this great land for all who will grasp it, but seldom have we seen it expressed more simply, more sincerely than by a South Milwaukee housewife who wrote a letter to the editor of the Milwaukee Sentinel last week. The letter reads:

"I reside in a lovely, quiet neighborhood.

"I am a Catholic by choice.

"Respect for both person and property is practiced by everyone in the neighborhood.

"Cleanliness of self, abode, and surroundings are of paramount importance to them.

"Everything that I possess was not given to me nor did I expect it to be. Much hard work and self-sacrifice were necessary to arrive at my present condition.

"I did not expect the Civil Rights Act to turn me white overnight as my color was no bar in the performance of downright hard work.

"Demonstrating, marching, and singing are appropriate in their place but they do not help much in performing necessary household duties, furthering education, and earning respect.

"I am a first-class citizen. I am a Menominee Indian."

After all that has been written and said about the problems of civil rights (and, of course, problems do exist) and about the dire needs of the Menominee Indians in Menominee County (and they do have dire needs). this simple but significant testimonial to American freedom and opportunity from one whose skin is not white comes as a breath of fresh air on the troubled world scene.

Children to Children Foundation Founded by Jeane Dixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most remarkable women of our age lives here in Washington, D.C. I am speaking of Jeane L. Dixon whose prophesies have proven startling and correct. Her gift, which she attributes to God, has given this woman a prominent place in our society. This she has unselfishly used for the betterment of mankind.

In 1964 she founded the Children to Children Foundation based on her experiences in working with individual children and their families during the past 25 years.

In Mrs. Dixon's own words: "Our purpose is to beautify the souls of children—to help children discover their own purpose and talents; to help children 'learn to learn' so they may grow to 'earn'—and lead useful lives and make their contributions to humanity."

Each One—Teach One: A Tree for Every Season

Spring: the maple tree. Summer: the fruit tree. Fall: the nutriment tree. Winter: the evergreen.

Because the evergreen tree symbolizes the Christmas season, the Children to Children, Inc., Foundation has chosen it to represent winter.

Each of the other trees—the maple, the fruit, and the nutriment trees have been chosen for their meaning to children during their respective seasons.

A tree has been selected for each of the seasons to symbolize the foundations concern for children on every day of every season throughout the year. The tree symbolizes the foundation's concern for future generations.

The primary aims of Children to Children, Inc.: First, to help children attain a continuing spiritual growth; second, to help children find their true talents and achieve their full mental and physical development; then they will know the true meaning of love, which is the first and great commandment, and is all important; third, to help children develop the means of self-help and, in their maturity, to strive to help others.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to enter a letter signed by Jeane L. Dixon as president of Children to Children, Inc.:

Dear Friend: My lifelong dream of a charitable foundation, with the help of others, to help children, has now been realized. You will forgive me if I take this opportunity to tell you about it.

Children to Children, Inc., is a worldwide foundation dedicated to helping children of all nations to help themselves. The everyday necessity of bringing up a large family can be applied throughout the world, let each one teach one.

The future of the world rests with the children of today. The foundation hopes to establish a better understanding within our own borders and between the peoples of all nations by helping to teach the children to help themselves.

Children to Children affords a vehicle for sustaining, encouraging, and promoting the natural understanding between the children of all nations. It is in youth that this feeling of friendship, mutual respect, and knowledge of the customs and beliefs of others can be seeded for the future peace of the world. As the twig is bent so will the tree grow.

The foundation will encourage, sponsor, and facilitate cultural exchanges in the arts, crafts, sciences, music, drama, literature, and health by every possible means. Exchange hostels, fellow scholarships and conference travel will be encouraged. Small family-style homes will be established. Schools will be given assistance. Ships will be fitted and equipped to help children living near the sea. Land and airborne vehicles will be utilized to meet children's needs in the interior. This foundation is set up to cooperate with all civic and governmental institutions to promote the spiritual and mental and physical growth of children.

Contributions: The foundation will devote its entire resources to help children throughout the world. Your contribution made payable to Children to Children, Inc., 1144 18th Streeet NW., Washington, D.C., 20036, will be used to teach children to help themselves. There are no deductions from the donors contribution for expenses. Sponsoring contributors will meet operating expenses. Your contribution is tax exempt.

Give while living: Children to Children is a long-range program. Contributions are needed now in cash or in kind. Your tax consultant or bank can best advise you on tax-exempt giving. Your attorney can assist you in estate giving by naming Children to Children in your will.

We welcome all contributions, however large or small.

Faithfully yours,

Jeane L. Dixon, *President*.

Another Berlin Wall?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, almost incredible are the efforts of President Johnson and his bunkhouse boys to control and meter out news to the press and the public.

Equally as incredible is the failure of a large segment of those occupying the field of communication—press, radio, and television—to vigorously and publicly protest these efforts of the President and his henchmen to establish a full blown censorship for the purpose of managing news at the White House.

Too little attention was paid in the past to the efforts of Secretary of Defense McNamara's manipulation of the news through his subordinate, Arthur Sylvester. Too little attention was paid to those responsible for the information "leak" that had for its purpose the smearing of Don Reynolds, a key figure in the Bobby Baker scandals.

Too little attention was paid to the "leak" in the State Department that had for its purpose the discrediting of Otto F. Otepka, chief security evaluator in that Department.

Now comes Joseph Alsop, columnist for the Washington Post, who, in an article on January 17, describes the espionage and control system that has been established in the White House for the purpose of manipulating information from that source.

Alsop says that most Presidents have tried in one way or another to manipulate the front and editorial pages of the press:

> But no previous President—

He asserts—

> has claimed the right to keep from the country the basic facts of the national situation, unless he sees fit to divulge them. This is the novelty, and a most alarming novelty it is.

Mary McGrory, feature writer for the Washington Evening Star, has written an amusing yet pointed open letter on the subject which is headed "Yellow Rose Calls White House," and Douglas Kiker, of the New York Herald Tribune, reveals that a start was actually made toward construction of a "Berlin Wall" at the White House, allegedly to further insulate the bunkhouse boys from newsmen seeking to supply the public with information concerning the operations of the Johnson administration.

Following are the articles by Mr. Alsop, Miss McGrory, and Mr. Kiker:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

FACTS AND UN-FACTS

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the excitement over the state of the Union message, something of great significance has passed all but unnoticed. Rather glaring new light has been shed, in fact, on President Johnson's strange notion of the right way to deal with the public.

To begin with, a part of the curious espionage system to which members of the White House staff are subjected has been rudely brought into the open. All staff members' telephone calls are noted. All places they visit outside the White House are reported by the Government chauffeurs. And these lists of contacts are nightly studied, for symptoms of dangerous associations, by the President's new alter ego, Marvin Watson.

The unfortunate White House Press Secretary, Bill D. Moyers, who more and more resembles a modern Saint Sebastian was required to explain that Watson's nightly list persusals were solely motivated by a desire to achieve operating economies. This was said with a straight face, and the nearest that could be managed in the way of a show of indignation.

Yet it is of course an open secret that the telephone and limousine checks are only parts of a much wider system of surveillance that now covers most of the city of Washington. It is informal, but it works very efficiently.

In brief, a great many sleazy persons are now aware that the quickest way to make Brownie points at the White House is to pass the word that "X" has been seen talking to "Y." Thus it is now an odds-on bet that any "X-Y" meeting, in a restaurant or other public place, will soon be added to the White House's dangerous associations list.

In addition, a fairly complete news control system has long been in force at the Pentagon. It was installed even before President Johnson's time by Secretary McNamara, who cannot quite get it through his head that he has thereby deprived the country of almost all protection against a Louis A. Johnson of the future.

Last week, finally, the State Department briefly tried to install a total news control system, and only retreated to installation of a partial system when sharp protest developed. And almost simultaneously the long-suffering Moyers, a good man trapped in a harsh predicament, gave the explanation of these puzzling phenomena in a television interview.

"It's very important for a President to maintain his options up until the moment of decision," said Moyers. "And for someone to speculate, days or weeks in advance, that he is going to do thus and thus, is to deny to the President that latitude he needs in order to make, in the light of the existing circumstances, the best possible decision."

Taken literally, this extraordinary statement appears to mean that the President cannot do whatever his duty requires him to do, if someone or other has already suggested in print that this is indeed what his duty will require. At any rate, this statement tells us why the President's attempts at news control are so much more aggressive comprehensive, and one must add, repugnant to American tradition, than any such attempts by other Presidents.

The key to the statement is that curious word, "options." In order to understand the strange meaning the President gives to this word, it is useful to recall the period, almost exactly a year ago, before President Johnson faced up to the realities of the Vietnamese situation.

At that time, in the highest circles of the Government, there was desperate and justified fear of an early Vietcong victory in South Vietnam. The same concern was felt by the U.S. Embassy and U.S. military staff in Saigon. From Saigon, the President was being repeatedly warned that nothing could save the situation except determined U.S. action, such as he later took after the attack on the Pleiku barracks.

In November and December, the fear in the Government and in Saigon, and all the compelling reasons for this fear, were reported with some emphasis by a few persons, including this correspondent. The reports were strictly factual, if anything understating the true situation. But the President was deeply infuriated by this public ventilation of a crisis of the utmost public importance.

And it was later authoritatively explained that he was only angry because his "options" were being restricted.

What he means by his "options," therefore, is the freedom to decide whether facts are indeed facts, or whether it will be more convenient to classify them as un-facts. The facts themselves cannot of course be wished away, nor can their impact be diminished on the American national situation. But if they are jut not mentioned, then they remain un-facts, as people who are unmentionable in the Soviet Union thereby become unpersons.

Most Presidents have of course tried in one way or another, to manipulate the front and editorial pages of the press. But no previous President has claimed the right to keep from the country the basic facts of the national situation, unless he sees fit to divulge them. This is the novelty, and a most alarming novelty it is.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

YELLOW ROSE CALLS WHITE HOUSE

(By Mary McGrory)

MR. MARVIN WATSON,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. WATSON: You know, of course, that Press Secretary Bill Moyers has explained and defended your practice of keeping a record of incoming telephone calls at the White House on the grounds of "efficiency, economy, and security."

Naturally all of us are for that, but as a patriotic American citizen I think I should tell you that you are barking up the wrong tree.

Take my own case. I show up on your lists as often as 20 times a day. But that's only half the story. What you need is the outgoing list. You'll never see me there.

No matter when I call or whom I call, he's "at a meeting" or "with the President" or "has some people with him." He's not spilling any state secrets to me, I can assure you.

Maybe we should all take the hint that the President will tell us reporters anything he thinks we ought to know, which you have to admit is not much. But we hear that a man's worth is gaged by the number of calls he gets, and he could lose his third telephone or even his job if he isn't in demand.

So we keep dialing, and I personally have had many pleasant conversations with the secretaries over there. I have learned that one of them is looking for an apartment on Connecticut Avenue and another is having trouble with her mother-in-law. I don't think these constitute breaches of the national security, and I hope you will agree.

Incidentally, would you consider giving us reporters code names or numbers? I have to spell my last name every time I call and it eats into my efficiency and also my morale. Could I be "Yellow Rose" or maybe 007? Or are you saving that for Walter Lippmann?

I want you to know that I have never descended to giving a fictitious name. A colleague of mine, whom I shall not name, on his sixth try for McGeorge Bundy, said he was Alexei Kosygin, and had to spell it.

Next week, he plans to be "Alexander Kerensky," and the week after, "Leon Trotsky." I think I have talked him out of using "Ho Chi Minh" on the grounds that it will start up a new flurry about "direct contact between Hanoi and Washington," which could cause a jamming of the White House switchboard. I have pointed out to him that you people have enough to do checking up on each other, and he has promised to think it over.

But to get back to my point of the incoming list not giving the big picture. A week ago Tuesday, for instance, I show up as calling Joe Califano 10 times between 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. I forget what I wanted to ask him, but the thing is he should not be credited—nor should I be charged—with the last two. I was merely trying to tell the secretary that my deadline had passed and that he should not bother to call back. The first time, all his lines were busy, and the second time, I got through. The secretary promised to take my name off the list and she was as good as her word. I have not heard from him to this day.

Also you should not be misled by those six calls I put in to Bill Moyers on Thursday. He does not spend his day on the horn chinning with me. Actually, when I finally got him and asked him about the future of a prominent Government official, he advised me not to write anything because "the President will make a statement about it in a few days." I'm still waiting.

Knowing Washington, you are naturally concerned that some people might just be calling up their White House acquaintance to scrounge some juicy morsel to drop into the conversation over a Georgetown dinner party. Some of us, Mr. Watson, never get to Georgetown dinner parties. We are sitting in our offices waiting for the White House to call back.

A friend of mine went out recently and sat next to a White House aid who sees the President all day. His conversation was confined to the adorable thing his 2-year-old had said that morning. His wife, during the ladies' hour, confided that she was going to name her next child Little Boy.

So, Mr. Watson, I can tell you there's no need to worry. Indiscretion has been practically wiped out in the executive branch. And your log of incoming calls would be cut right down to a splinter if you could persuade your boss to hold regular press conferences.

Sincerely yours,

Yellow Rose.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Jan. 12, 1966]

White House Cancels "Berlin Wall" Project

(By Douglas Kiker)

Washington.—White House Special Assistant Marvin Watson gave orders last fall that a high, concrete-block wall be built down one side of the White House to block the view of the adjoining Executive Office Building, it was learned yesterday.

Others on President Johnson's staff succeded in canceling the job order, but only after ground was broken by workers at night and the job was started.

The wall would have run from Pennsylvania Avenue down West Executive Avenue, past the West Executive entrance to the White House. Its principal purpose was to prevent reporters who use that entrance from looking into office windows of the adjoining Executive Office Building.

Most of the President's principal assistants work in the White House proper, but the huge, old, ornate Executive Office Building across the street houses offices of the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Council, and the Office of Emergency Planning, among others.

CRITICISM

When other White House staff members became aware of the plan to build a wall, they intervened with the argument that such construction would result in widespread criticism and would be compared with the Berlin wall.

Yesterday White House Press Secretary Bill Moyers confirmed a story by Herald Tribune Columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak to the effect that, at Mr. Watson's direction, a record of all incoming calls to White House special assistants is being kept by telephone operators.

The record includes both the name of the person calling and the person called. But, Mr. Moyers said that to describe this as a "gumshoe operation is a very clever but inaccurate and unwarranted description."

The press secretary also confirmed that questions sometimes have planted with reporters prior to some of the President's news conferences. But, he added, "it takes two to tango."

He was questioned at length by reporters on both White House security and press relations. The first was the result of the Evans-Novak column.

The second was the result of a television interview in which Mr. Moyers said the press is often "poorly informed," tends to write "its opinion" other than the facts, and that the President has neither a "statutory obligation" nor a "moral obligation" to hold press conferences.

Yesterday Mr. Moyers said the telephone records are being kept only for reasons of economy and security.

"We are trying to study the different workloads of each special assistant," he said. And "one of the things that grew out of the Dillon report, which was based on the Warren report, was the necessity for better records on calls to the White House."

As for the names, he continued, "your names have always been taken down, either by the secretary or by the telephone operator."

He said names are taken for reasons of security. He said that other special presidential assistants informally report to him on calls they have received from reporters. But, he said, "there has never been, to my knowledge, an effort to keep White House staff assistants from talking to reporters."

Other reliable White House sources said yesterday, however, that, in fact, many of Mr. Johnson's assistants dislike the practice and hope to see it discontinued in the near future.

Mr. Moyers also confirmed that records are kept on all trips and stops made by White House limousines.

But, he said, to suggest this is evidence of further "gumshoe" activity "is silly," because "a log has always been kept."

It is being used now, however, he said, to eliminate "unnecessary and unofficial trips, including taking one's wife to a party or buying groceries or other such unofficial requirements."

As a result, the White House chauffeur force has been cut from 100 to 60 in recent weeks, he said.

He said he expects the President, "with some regularity," to hold press conferences—his last was on August 29— but said illness and other work have kept him from meeting with reporters "as often as he would have under other circumstances."

But, he added, "I think he has been accessible. I think you have had a chance to see him. I think the news has been made available."

Asked if Mr. Johnson has ever "evidenced any interest in discovering the source of an unattributable story which he might have preferred not to have had in print," Mr. Moyers said, "Any President is going to be interested in who gave what story to a reporter."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a communication of the director of public relations of the department of Maine of the American Legion be placed in the Record because of its timely reminder of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday on February 6, 1966.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Orrington, Maine,
January 2, 1966.

Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday

My Fellow Americans: On Sunday, February 6, 1966, the Department of Maine, American Legion, will lead the statewide observance of the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. We urge all Legion and auxiliary groups and the churches of Maine to join with us in this observance.

The heroic story of the four chaplains—George L. Fox, Methodist; Alexander D. Goode, Jewish; Johnny P. Washington, Catholic; and Clark V. Poling, Reformed Church, is a legend in our time. Four men of God who gave their lives to save others on the sinking troopship USS *Dorchester* in the North Atlantic on that icy February morning during World War II. The ship, torpedoed by the enemy, was sinking when the four chaplains removed their lifejackets, gave them to others, and then stood together on the sinking ship praying for their shipmates.

We urge you to contact all churches in your area requesting special observance during the Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday. Contact the clubs and organizations of your community and give leadership to a special effort to promote the observance of Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday.

Legion post commanders and chaplains assisted by public relations officers should also contact local radio and television stations seeking to stimulate interest in this observance.

All posts, county and district organizations are requested to hold a special Four Chaplains Memorial program during the month of February.

In a time of crisis for our Nation there is a message of strength in the story of the four chaplains. There is the courage of men of God and the living memorial of the sacrifices of all chaplains in the service of our Nation.

Maine and the Nation need to be reminded of the religious heritage and the courage and devotion of all people of good faith. We can tell this story by our observance of Four Chaplains Memorial Sunday and by the retelling of the story of the four men of God—Americans all—serving God and country.

Let Sunday, February 6, 1966, be a banner day in the history of the Maine American Legion. Let it be a day of rededication to the principles of "for God and country." Let the message of the four chaplains be told by all American Legion groups in Maine.

Many thanks,

Daniel E. Lambert,
Director of Public Relations, the American Legion.

Approved: Sidney H. Schwartz, Department Commander, the American Legion.

Subsidies by Any Other Name Are Still Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the maritime situation is receiving widespread attention because of the maritime task force report recently released, the shortage of ships to carry supplies to Vietnam, and the shortage of licensed officers to man the ships.

The matter of subsidies for shipbuilding and ship operations is a favorite subject for criticism. In this connection, I believe several recent articles in the Baltimore Sun by Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, the paper's very able maritime editor, will be extremely helpful in shedding some light on this matter and wish to insert them in the Appendix:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Nov. 1, 1965]

Waterfront Sidelights

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

New York, October 31.—A fellow maritime newspaper editor the other day asked whether we had read "This Is Marad," a booklet published earlier this year by the Maritime Administration regarding its operations.

We replied affirmatively and thought nothing more about it. But our colleague pursued the matter with the comment, "Boy, you'd never think that the same person who put that out would put out the task force report or make all of the speeches he is making now."

His reference was to Nicholas Johnson, the Maritime Administrator, whose photograph appears on the page containing the foreword to "This Is Marad."

TASK FORCE REPORT

The 31-year-old Administrator also is often referred to as the one whose thinking produced most of the recently issued controversial recommendations of the interagency maritime task force as to how the American merchant marine should be reconstructed and operated in the future.

The last two paragraphs of the foreword read:

"In good times and in bad, in peace and in war, the United States needs merchant ships to carry its trade, to contribute to its economy, to protect its worldwide interests. It is our job at the Maritime Administration to see that the American people have that kind of merchant marine; but this responsibility can be adequately discharged only if the American people understand the role of the merchant marine in our national life.

"I hope this booklet will help to promote such understanding."

"FOR WAR AND PEACE"

Under this title "For War and Peace," it states:

"Merchant ships perform a dual service. In peacetime they carry on the trade between nations; in war or national emergencies they serve either as an integral part or as an adjunct to the Armed Forces, carrying military goods and personnel or materials essential to war production or to sustain the civilian population.

"In peacetime American merchant ships must compete in the open market against foreign shipping for the world's trade; in wartime they usually work directly for the Government. To this dual role can be attributed the concern of the Nation for the adequacy of the merchant fleet."

"DEMONSTRATED MANY TIMES"

Under the heading of national security, the booklet says:

"Since the founding of our Nation, the importance of a strong American merchant marine has been forcibly demonstrated many times. * * * As in the preceding centuries, the last 65 years have brought many occasions when the security of the Nation was dependent in large measure on the availability of a strong and active U.S. merchant marine."

It cites instances from World War I and World War II when this country had to provide the free world with most of its merchant ships, from Korea, the Suez Canal, and Lebanon.

"IN EVENT OF LIMITED WAR"

And then it adds, "Although war strategy plans have changed with the introduction of new weapons, present Department of Defense plans still call for the use of substantial numbers of merchant ships for purely military purposes in the event of a limited war."

The last paragraph under that heading states:

"There are separate but related needs for sustaining America's defense and civilian economies in time of war. The existence of a substantial, fast modern merchant fleet under the American flag is an essential element in any plan to meet these vital needs.

"To deter aggression in threatened areas throughout the world, we have positioned men and equipment in many lands. In 1963, 1,340,000 tons of cargo to supply these forces were carried by the U.S.-subsidized lines alone."

Under the heading "Economic Strength," "This is Marad" says:

"Less dramatic but fully important today is the contribution which a U.S. merchant fleet makes to the economic welfare of the country by assuring uninterrupted movement of the agricultural, manufactured-and raw materials in the foreign commerce which is necessary to the continued and ever-increasing prosperity of the country.

"LARGEST TRADING NATION

"The United States is the world's largest trading Nation, accounting for 15 percent of all world trade. About 99 percent of this trade moves by sea.

"We depend upon a large variety of imported foods, raw materials and other products to maintain our high standard of living, and to supply necessary elements of many of the manufactured exports which we in turn ship to other nations.

"As American oceanborne foreign commerce increases during the next 20 years from its present level of about $30 billion to a projected level of nearly $60 billion, it is essential that we maintain effective control over the rates and services of the shipping lines which will carry our trade.

"DOMESTIC BENEFITS

"Finally, there are substantial domestic economic benefits from the merchant marine. The maritime industry, including the merchant portion of the shipbuilding industry, generates about $1.5 billion in gross national product and pays about $75 million in Federal and local taxes. In addition, the 100,000 maritime employees pay about $80 million in personal income taxes.

"The provision of shipping services by U.S.-flag ships conserves about $800 million of our dollar exchange each year, thus aiding our balance-of-payments position.

"It has been demonstrated that we cannot depend upon other countries to supply at all times the ships needed for the defense and trade of the United States.

"SHIPS AND SHIPBUILDING

"We must, therefore, maintain enough ships, shipbuilding capacity, experienced shipping companies, and skilled workmen and seamen of our own to provide a U.S. merchant marine adequate to the demands of both war and peace."

The above quotations—all from a booklet published earlier this year by the Maritime Administration—reflect the thinking of most people about the American merchant marine. As we noted earlier, these were made over the signature of the Administrator.

The reason the President's Maritime Advisory Committee took such a strong stand against the task force report was its apparent initial aim—of providing a merchant marine only adequate to take care of one initial emergency needs of this Nation.

The justification given in the task force report is that that proposal will give the Nation more ships than if the fleet continues on its present course.

Neither of these two courses is the answer to the problem. The answer should be a merchant marine strong and large enough to take care of this country's military and commercial needs.

The situation right now is strong evidence that, despite the large numbers of ships in the reserve fleet, there is question whether the merchant fleet is adequate to do both even though Uncle Sam is involved in only a "brush fire" in southeast Asia.

MSTS DECLARES NEED

The Military Sea Transportation Service let it be known last week that more ships are needed on this run and has called all the shipowners in for a conference Tuesday.

Even before this, MSTS has had to use foreign-flag ships to supplement the American vessels to Vietnam. According to an affidavit submitted by Vice Adm. Glynn R. Donaho, MSTS commander, 14 foreign ships were chartered between June 10 and September 8.

Since that time, at least two foreign ships have been chartered—with Maritime Administration approval—to supplement the commercial operations of subsidized steamship lines on essential trade routes because they had so many bottoms serving Vietnam.

MORE CHARTERS LIKELY

And there have been indications that more foreign vessels may be chartered for this purpose—provided foreign ones can be obtained in view of the worldwide demand for moving military supplies to southeast Asia, moving Canadian wheat to Russia and Red China, as well as moving the regular everyday cargoes.

Certainly this would indicate that the U.S. active fleet at this time is not adequate to sustain America's defense and civilian economies in time of peace, let alone war—the administration keeps emphasizing the Vietnam situation is not a war, but a brush fire and everything is being handled on a business-as-usual basis.

CONDITION OF RESERVE FLEET

There appears to be considerable speculation about the condition of the reserve fleet, whether the remaining vessels are in condition to be broken out or whether the costs will justify breaking them out.

An independent ship surveyor who has visited most of the reserve fleets notes that the Liberty ships which are being sold for scrap are in better condition than many of the Victory type being reactivated.

He explained that the Liberty is a simple ship and there is not too much electrical and electronic work aboard "to go bad," which means a minimum expense for reactivation. This is not true of the Victories and C–2's.

WAR MIGHT ABSORB COST

If ships are as sorely needed as MSTS would indicate, it seems the cost of breaking them out would be meaningless, would just be one of the items absorbed in the expenditure of the "brush fire" in Vietnam.

Despite all the pronouncements out of Washington that war strategy plans have changed, only last week the Navy Department said 93 percent of the supplies moving to Vietnam are going by sea.

This in itself should make some of the detractors of the merchant marine take notice.

BOOKLET AND REPORT

How can one justify the booklet's words under the heading of "Economic Strength" and then turn around and say we can depend on foreign ships for these cargoes cited?

That section emphasizes that merchant shipbuilding along with the rest of the maritime industry generates about $1.5 billion in the gross national product, and yet the task force is calling for shipbuilding in foreign yards hereafter.

The booklet also states that the Federal Government receives at least $130 million in taxes from the maritime industry and that American-flag ships conserve about $800 million of this country's dollar exchange, thus contributing to the balance of payments.

FIGURES SEEM STILL VALID

Do these figures no longer mean anything?

Is it no longer important to this country to be able to control rates?

"This is Marad" states that the high standard of living in the United States—"of which we are most proud"—makes it difficult to provide and maintain a merchant fleet competing in international trade with other nations—and, therefore, Government assistance has been made available to offset these cost differentials.

NOW CRITICAL OF HIGHER COSTS

And yet the tone of the maritime administrator in recent statements has been critical of the higher costs in the United States and anxious for the United States to have "truly competitive shipbuilding and shipping industries."

Maybe the independent unnamed economists who have persuaded Johnson that it would be better to build in foreign yards and lean toward foreign countries for this form of transportation could explain it all better.

My colleague and I are still confused.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 13, 1965]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: JOHNSON NOW ELABORATE IN TASK FORCE ADVOCACY

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, December 12.—Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator, has been arguing for the position of the controversial task force report.

Johnson was one of four high Government officials who addressed the Maritime Trades Department of the AFL–CIO during its 3-day biennial convention here.

In terms of rank, the four could be listed as follows:

John H. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor.

Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.

George H. Hearn, one of five Commissioners on the Federal Maritime Commission.

Nicholas Johnson, Maritime Administrator.

OTHERS UNACCOMPANIED

Henning made this trip unaccompanied by any member of his staff and held no press conference.

Boyd likewise traveled without any aids and held no press conference although he had a frank and open discussion with the press after his speech. Although Boyd is chairman of the task force, he pulled no behind-the-scenes punches.

Hearn also traveled alone without any aids and held no press conference.

Nicholas Johnson had two men make the trip from Washington with him, although he has been loudly stressing Government economy.

TWO JOHNSON AIDS

One of those with Johnson, although not on the same plane, was Ivan Scott, who is being characterized as the "personal public relations" man for Johnson.

Scott was employed as of December 1 and his first assignment was that of traveling to the west coast to set up press conferences in each of the four areas visited by the Maritime Administrator. There already is a press information center in the Maritime Administration.

The other was George R. Griffiths, sometimes described as the Maritime Administration's liaison man with the military Sea Transportation Service and other times as a special assistant to Johnson, of which there are increasing numbers.

PRESS CONFERENCE OBJECTIONS

At the press conference in San Francisco—the first of the four and the only one attended by this reporter—it was difficult to obtain direct answers from Johnson about the task force recommendations as differing from those of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

Johnson also had several members from the local staff of the Maritime Administration accompanying him a good part of the time he was in San Francisco, Portland, Seattle, and Los Angeles.

This array undoubtedly was impressive to some persons.

SOME DISSENTING OWNERS

For example, when he tried to impress upon the press that the Advisory Committee recommendations were not accepted by three committee members, he failed to add, until questioned, that two of the objectors were major foreign-flag shipowners.

Johnson failed to say that the third, a banker, had at first, refused to join the committee because he feared a conflict of interest in that his bank had foreign-flag customers. Furthermore, this member has attended almost no meetings, including the last one.

Paul Hall, president of the maritime trades department, called Johnson "stupid," but was glad that he was because he had openly shown how the Government was going to sabotage the American merchant marine.

"GOING TO DO TO US"

Preceding maritime administrators had taken steps to undercut the merchant fleet, Hall said, "but never before one stood up and said publicly what they are going to do to us."

Hall also in public accused Johnson of "deliberate misuse of statistics" and of juggling figures "to justify this lie" of how much the subsidy to individual seamen is in comparison with that to farmers.

Hall explained that when the Maritime Administration calculated how much the operating subsidy payments to seamen amounted to, it divided only the number of men actually going to sea aboard the subsidized ships into the amount of the subsidy rather than taking into consideration the persons backing up that operation on shore, such as the office staffs and shipyard workers.

MORE RECKONED FARMERS

On the other hand, to lessen the agriculture amount, the Seafarers' official said, the Maritime Administration adds up every family member on any 10-acre plot that produced $50 worth in a year, plus 1.5 million retired farmers, several million farmers who receive no subsidy, to those who are subsidized and actually earn their pay at farming.

Thus, the farm figure comes out to about $1,100 per person, while the seaman subsidy quoted by Johnson is $7,500 to $12,000 a man.

If the shipping industry was given the same broad general description as that of agriculture, Hall asserted the figures per person would be identical because shipping would then be $1,190 per person.

"SMALL-MINDED PEOPLE"

"These small-minded people are killing off this industry," Hall declared.

The description of a sneaking stumping tour applied to Johnson's trip did not come from labor, but from one of the country's outstanding management spokesmen—Paul St. Sure, chairman of the Pacific Maritime Association and a member of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee.

Other persons here feel Johnson is out to prove that he has been able to hold down the subsidy outlay to merchant shipping.

CALLS RESEARCH BETTER DRAW

St. Sure related that Johnson told shipping executives here that although he could do nothing about getting more subsidy to build more than 15 to 17 ships a year in American yards, he could get $2 billion for a research and development program.

American shipyards have contended right along that if they could get any assurance of a regular shipbuilding program—the 15 to 17 ships a year mean Government assistance of about $100 million—they would be able to do more toward modernizing their facilities to reduce costs further.

This might be as good a place as any to put some of those research and development billions.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 20, 1965]

AROUND THE WATERFRONTS LABOR GAINS LIGHT ON SHIPPING

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, December 19.—The maritime unions performed a monumental job toward getting the story of the maritime industry moved "inland" when they succeeded in getting it placed on the congressional checklist of the AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education.

That action at the recent AFL–CIO convention is described as a major coup by the leaders of the seamen's unions because hereafter it will mean that 12 million members of the AFL–CIO and their families will be confronted with the fact that there is a maritime industry in the United States and that apparently it is important to all organized labor—which means it must be considered when candidates are indorsed

MANAGEMENT'S CHANCE TO ADD

Now it will be interesting to see what management does to match this performance or to uphold its "share" of putting the maritime industry across to the general public.

Never has the American shipping industry had the opportunity it now has nor is it likely to have it again if it flubs this time as it has done many times in the past.

The stage was set by Nicholas Johnson, the youthful Maritime Administrator, in a speech last February 9 when he first said publicly that, as far as he was concerned, part of the industry was to be scuttled and the rest of it was to be revamped.

A climax was reached October 7 when the contents of the Interagency maritime task force report were formally made public and found to be quite similar to the February 9 curtain raiser.

Meanwhile, fortunately, functioning in another theater was a three-part cast—composed of public, labor and management members—known as the President's Maritime Advisory Committee with the assignment of developing a long-range program to improve the U.S. merchant marine.

They did not like the contents of the task force presentation and drew up their own.

CONTRASTS SEE SAME GOAL

Each program now is being performed with a different view in mind, because the basic lines are so different—such as building abroad, eliminating cargo preference and American-flag passenger ships.

However, both claim to have the same goal—that of improving the merchant marine.

Johnson, with an entourage of aids and press conferences wherever he goes, has been conducting a tour to promote his curtain-raiser thoughts.

Not following precedent, labor and management have engaged the same stage—the National Shipping Conference—and the same program as their theme to offset the task force.

BOYD OFFERS OLIVE BRANCH

Alan S. Boyd, the chairman of the task force and Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, extended an olive branch here ten days ago and said, "Let's stop shooting each other and reach a common ground."

Reportedly, the Defense Department has employed a "whiz kid" engineering outfit to put the two reports side by side, compare them and come out with a middle-of-the-road program. There is confirmation of this.

And then, of course, there is the comparative analysis of the two which the task force team made and which was not supposed to be made public—as was determined by the Advisory Committee and John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce. However, Johnson released most of its contents in his first speech of his recent campaign.

JOHNSON ROUSES INDUSTRY

If Johnson has done nothing else, he has shocked most of the industry—labor and management—into realization that something has to be done and done soon if the maritime industry of the United States, first, is to be saved and, second, is to expand.

His statements described by his opponents as inaccuracies and half-truths have helped toward the alert.

As a result of all this, there is more of a furor in the Nation over the merchant marine than perhaps at any time since 1936 when the act was passed.

VIETNAM CALLS ATTENTION

With the Vietnam situation becoming more critical and ships playing a large role there, shipping once again has the value of its contribution to defense being portrayed daily before the Nation.

Thus the stage has been set so that the industry has an opportunity such as it has not had for three decades.

With knowledge of all this background, it was startling to hear that the west coast president of a subsidized steamship company remarked here Friday that, since his company's ships were sailing chock-a-block full, he could not see any reason why his company should contribute money toward any type of an advertising or promotion campaign now.

It was particularly disheartening because there had been a bit of a reason to believe this man's eyes had been opened earlier in the week to the fact that the industry's continued negligence of promotion, of better understanding, has contributed to its rather squeegy position today.

Such narrow points of view are exactly what has been wrong with the American maritime industry for scores of years and apparently is going to remain if his attitude is an indication.

When business has been at a peak, the American shipping industry has shrugged its shoulders and said it was pointless to put on a program of any kind because there was no need for it—business was good.

MONEY LAGS WITH BUSINESS

When business has slacked off and rides along at a low ebb with bludgeoning from every side, the industry declares it does not have the money then to do anything to offset it.

The shipowners' and shipyards' inconsistency has helped box them into their present undesirable position and sometimes it is difficult to sympathize with them.

It would not be surprising if other top industry officials feel somewhat like the west coast president.

UNION PROPAGANDA ARM

As was noted, the labor unions have made a major contribution toward getting the word into Dubuque, Iowa; Denver, St. Louis, and other places for next year's congressional election and thereafter. From now on there will be a space for each Congressman's name to show whether he voted the right way on maritime legislation.

The AFL–CIO Committee on Political Education is powerful in swinging votes, organized labor claims, and is getting more so every year now that it has the full support of the AFL–CIO behind it.

For a while the committee floundered because the top echelon of the AFL–CIO was not supporting it.

But it kept plugging along until finally the executive council blessed it. The committee functions on a $1-a-year contribution from each member of a union—or at least the dollar per member is its goal.

All of that is a real achievement, but there is considerable work to be done between now and the congressional elections to put over a merchant marine program to the Nation—to let them know why they need a fleet adequate both for defense and commercial purposes. No more time should be wasted while the industry sits around and wonders, What do we do now?

NEED TO AID REPUTATION

Some definite strides toward a real improvement in public image must be made immediately—and that can only be done through a well-financed public relations program.

And while they are thinking along these lines, both management and labor should knock their heads together and be willing to improve labor relations in the industry so that part of the way the public thinks of them will recover.

There is no doubt that the decrepit labor relations in the maritime industry—and both sides are at fault—has been a major assist to Johnson in selling his negative views and criticisms of the industry.

LEADERS ON BOTH SIDES

The individual leaders on both sides of the bargaining table should look in the mirror and ask what is more important: personal aggrandizement or the overall healthy industry.

Yes, the stage has been set. The lines are partially written. The cast is available. Everything affirmative is there for the industry. But only if the members of the cast trust each other and cooperate with each other—management within management, labor within labor, as well as labor and management and public parties—and only if the lines are properly developed can a four-star performance be the result. Such a performance not only would be for the industry, but for the Nation as a whole.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Dec. 26, 1965]

U.S. SUBSIDY PLANS COVER MANY AREAS—MERCHANT MARINE NOT ALONE IN FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 23.—The merchant marine has been singled out for tremendous criticism about its subsidy in recent years, while the only other Government-assisted program referred to constantly is the farm subsidy.

However, a recently published report prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress reveals nine pages of listings of various grants made annually by Uncle Sam to all elements of the Nation's business and economic life.

The introduction to chapter II, entitled "Scope of Studies," begins, "A better understanding and appreciation of the sweeping, amorphous character of subsidy programs may be gained by a mere listing of the various Federal programs, past and present, which, by one criterion or another, might be considered to partake of or involve an element of subsidy regardless of original intent of any particular program."

LISTED AS GRANTS

Under the heading of "Grants to business firms and corporations to carry out specific objectives," it lists the following:

Shipbuilding differential subsidy—Maritime Administration; shipbuilding subsidy for fishing vessels—Interior Department; ship-operating differential subsidy; subsidies to wartime producers of various raw materials and consumer items to stimulate production without violating price ceilings; land grants and cash contributions for railroad construction; Government subscriptions to railroad securities; subsidies for carrying mail—ship and civil air carriers; partial financing of plants to generate electricity from atomic fuels.

In the chapter on transportation subsidies, it discusses the assistance that has been given to the airlines since 1925 and noted that today the subsidy payouts in air transportation are devoted to the 14 local service carriers and carriers in Alaska and Hawaii. These amount to about $85 million a year.

"Aside from these direct subsidies, air carriers have also benefited from such varied governmental assistance as airport and airway facilities, other navigation aids, aeronautical research and development conducted under governmental auspices, the safety regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the sale of surplus aircraft, available to both new and existing companies engaged in civil transport," the report said.

WIDELY DEBATED

On the matter of motor carriers, it noted that whether the extensive expenditures on highway and street improvement constituted a direct subsidy to the motor carrier industry has been widely debated.

Representatives of the motor carrier industry have contended that through registration fees, gasoline taxes, and other charges which have gone into the construction of public roads, the industry has met all the costs properly attributable to it. This is denied by railroad spokesmen."

And in regard to railroads, the report contended that the total and net subsidies to railroads by Federal and State government are subject to some uncertainty.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 10, 1966]

AROUND THE WATERFRONT: CONGRESS HAS ITS CHANCE FOR MAJOR MARITIME CURES

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

WASHINGTON, January 9.—Today's opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress brings with it a call for some major changes in the Nation's maritime legislation—changes depending, of course, on whether the administration pursues the course promised by some of its lesserlings.

Whether much is done remains uncertain despite the two divergent reports on the American merchant marine that have aroused everyone in and around the maritime industry since last September.

This is the first time in recent maritime history—the last 30 years—that there has been so much turmoil over the industry in the months preceding the opening of Congress. It appears the path has been opened for major action.

In addition to dependence upon the administration's bidding, there will be the desires of Congress itself—whether the committees responsible for the merchant marine are prepared or are willing to take steps on their own.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee will be headed by a new chairman—EDWARD A. GARMATZ, a Maryland Democrat. Senator MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, a former seaman, will continue as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee.

This could be the first time in the last few years that these two committees work together, inasmuch as MAGNUSON and the late Representative Bonner, Democrat, of North Carolina, whom GARMATZ succeeds, did not get along well together. Joining of hands in this direction could be fruitful for the industry and the program as a whole.

GARMATZ walks in as chairman at a time which affords him the opportunity as a whole to do more for the industry than any chairman has had since the 1936 act was passed.

He can also do his own constitutents considerable good since they are so closely linked to the American maritime welfare—provided overall welfare is properly handled and GARMATZ has loyal persons working on it.

Since the 1936 act was passed, most of the legislation has been geared toward the subsidized end of the industry, which today is the best part of the American merchant marine. The tramps and independents did get the Cargo Preference Act, the trade-in-and-build program, and mortgage insurance when the Republicans were in power.

It is the tramp or bulk-carrier segment of the merchant marine that has been cited by both reports as requiring improvement at once. Although legislation was passed in 1952 enabling bulk carriers to be built with subsidy assistance, the Maritime administration has not approved any of the applications filed in recent years for the construction of such sorely needed vessels.

Perhaps new legislation is not the complete answer. Perhaps a thorough investigation as to why the administration has not paid any heed to congressional wishes concerning the merchant fleet might be more in order.

The House Merchant Marine Committee has never been considered a particularly strong or important committee—primarily because the industry has never made itself recognized properly as a truly important industry to the United States.

Certainly over the years the industry has shied away from making the committee members feel as if they actually had done a job and had more to do.

Contributions to political campaigns from the shipping industry have always been considered in the "niggardly" class in congressional circles.

And now it has all come home—and the industry recognizes that, with the attitude of many administration officials, its future is dependent upon Congress.

Regardless of any of the past or any personal feelings, the congressional committees have a responsibility to the people of the United States to provide them with a strong American-flag merchant marine and a healthy maritime complex built around that fleet.

It is on that premise they should act.

CHANCE FOR HOUSE GROUP

The House Merchant Marine Committee can become a very important one on Capitol Hill this year if the overall picture is properly encompassed and presented.

As the second session opens, there is not only the question of a new policy for the American merchant marine, with two divergent reports serving as background, but there also is the fact that this country has found itself in rather a peculiar position in trying to supply ships to handle its own cargoes to Vietnam—although the reserve fleets are monumental in size.

And then there is the matter of the U.S.S. *Yarmouth Castle*, the Panama-flag passenger ship operating out of Miami on a regular run to Nassau, which burned with 90 persons—mostly Americans—losing their lives.

GOVERNMENT-AID CARGOES

Still undecided is whether U.S.-flag ships are receiving their share of Government-aid cargoes and, if not, why not.

All of these and more are matters that should be taken up by the congressional committees primarily responsible for the American merchant marine this year—first determining the adequacy of that fleet and how an adequate fleet can be maintained for this country so that when Vietnams break out there is no problem as to availability of merchant ships for both military and commercial use.

The committees might consider some way of finding out what is going on within the Maritime Administration. This might be something to consider as a permanent part of the committee staff work.

MAY NEED MORE STAFF

With the Yarmouth Castle disaster, the task force-Maritime Advisory Committee reports, and Vietnam, the House committee naturally must expand its staff to be able properly to handle all these matters.

Representative GARMATZ months ago asked for an accounting of the ships in the reserve fleet. As far as is known, he has never been given that information. If the information was kept on record as it should be and should have been, the new chairman could have had the proper answer to his request within a matter of days.

Yes, there is plenty to be done this year—and the merchant marine and maritime industry is looking to Congress to lead the way.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Jan. 12, 1966]

Merchant Marine of United States Threatened With Oblivion

(By Helen Delich Bentley, maritime editor of the Sun)

Washington, January 11.—Commerce Department officials, it was learned today, have threatened subsidized shipowners that if they did not accept the interagency maritime task force report on a drastic new shipping policy, the American merchant marine "will be budgeted into oblivion."

This intimidation was made last month after Alan S. Boyd, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and task force chairman, in San Francisco called for a "compromise" on the two contradictory reports—that of the task force and the other of the President's Maritime Advisory Committee—on how the American-flag fleet should be rescued.

NEITHER SIDE GETTING ANYWHERE

Although Boyd was not present when the threat was made, two officials from his Department who presumably had authority to speak conducted the conference. The general tone of the session was that the ship operators should go through the task force report, find what "you can swallow," and the rest "would be forced upon the industry."

At the time of his call for a compromise, Boyd said before the maritime trades department of the AFL–CIO that neither side was getting anywhere holding fast to its views, that the United States had become great because throughout history there had been compromises, and he felt it was important for the future of the American merchant marine that a compromise be reached on the two policy reports.

It was when industry officials went to the Commerce Department to find out what was meant by the call to compromise that the warning was given to them.

The Commerce Department holds the key to the budget of the subsidized segment of the American merchant marine now because the Maritime Administration is an agency of that Department.

Therefore, whatever budget is sought by the Maritime Administration must then be fitted into the overall budget of the Commerce Department before it goes on to the Bureau of the Budget.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY SOUGHT

It is because of this hold of the Commerce Department over the merchant marine that several bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 89th Congress to have the Maritime Administration made an independent agency. Those bills are expected to be acted upon this session.

The Budget Bureau had representation on the task force, as did several other Government departments not considered friendly to the American merchant marine. Among the controversial recommendations in that report are the building of American ships abroad; phasing out of all American ships from the passenger business; revamping the entire system of subsidy payments; building new bulk carriers, but only five a year; and holding down the amount of foreign commerce to be transported on American-flag ships to less than the present 9 percent.

It also would have this country depend on foreign-flag ships for commercial purposes should all of the U.S.-flag vessels be used for military transportation.

ELEVEN SHIPS RECOMMENDED

Whether the reported cutback in new shipbuilding to be presented to Congress in the new budget is part of that threat cannot be determined yet.

According to information available, the Budget Bureau is recommending that only 11 new ships be built in fiscal 1967. This is the lowest number since the replacement program got fully underway in fiscal 1958.

It is said to be 4 less than what the Commerce Department called for and about 10 or so less than what the Maritime Administration called for.

Yellow Rose Calls White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Sunday edition of the Washington Star of January 16, an article appeared which I am sure will be of interest to the readers of the Congressional Record. Mary McGrory's column "Yellow Rose Calls White House" is an excellent piece of satire on the White House order to report the comings and goings and phone calls of White House employees. Her column follows:

Yellow Rose Calls White House

(By Mary McGrory)

Mr. Marvin Watson,
Special Assistant to the President,
The White House.

Dear Mr. Watson: You know, of course, that Press Secretary Bill Moyers has explained and defended your practice of keeping a record of incoming telephone calls at the White House on the grounds of "efficiency, economy, and security."

Naturally all of us are for that, but as a patriotic American citizen I think I should tell you that you are barking up the wrong tree.

Take my own case. I show up on your lists as often as 20 times a day. But that's only half the story. What you need is the outgoing list. You'll never see me there.

No matter when I call or whom I call, he's "at a meeting" or "with the President" or "has some people with him." He's not spilling any state secrets to me, I can assure you.

Maybe we should all take the hint that the President will tell us reporters anything he thinks we ought to know, which you have to admit is not much. But we hear that a man's worth is gaged by the number of calls he gets, and he could lose his third telephone or even his job if he isn't in demand.

So we keep dialing, and I personally have had many pleasant conversations with the secretaries over there. I have learned that one of them is looking for an apartment on Connecticut Avenue and another is having trouble with her mother-in-law. I don't think these constitute breaches of the national security, and I hope you will agree.

Incidentally, would you consider giving us reporters code names or numbers? I have to spell my last name every time I call and it eats into my efficiency and also my morale. Could I be "Yellow Rose" or maybe 007? Or are you saving that for Walter Lippmann?

I want you to know that I have never descended to giving a fictitious name. A colleague of mine, whom I shall not name, on his sixth try for McGeorge Bundy, said he was Alexei Kosygin, and had to spell it.

Next week he plans to be "Alexander Kerensky," and the week after "Leon Trotsky." I think I have talked him out of using "Ho Chi Minh" on the grounds that it will start up a new flurry about "direct contact between Hanoi and Washington," which could cause a jamming of the White House switchboard. I have pointed out to him that you people have enough to do checking up on each other, and he has promised to think it over.

But to get back to my point of the incoming list not giving the big picture. A week ago Tuesday, for instance, I show up as calling Joe Califano 10 times between 11 a.m. and 7 p.m. I forget what I wanted to ask him, but the thing is he should not be credited—nor should I be charged—with the last two. I was merely trying to tell the secretary that my deadline had passed and that he should not bother to call back. The first time, all his lines were busy, and the second time, I got through.

The secretary promised to take my name off the list and she was as good as her word. I have not heard from him to this day.

Also you should not be misled by those six calls I put in to Bill Moyers on Thursday. He does not spend his day on the horn chinning with me. Actually, when I finally got him and asked him about the future of a prominent government official, he advised me not to write anything because the President will make a statement about it in a few days. I'm still waiting.

Knowing Washington, you are naturally concerned that some people might just be calling up their White House acquaintance to scrounge some juicy morsel to drop into the conversation over a Georgetown dinner party. Some of us, Mr. Watson, never get to Georgetown dinner parties. We are sitting in our offices waiting for the White House to call back.

A friend of mine went out recently and sat next to a White House aid who sees the President all day. His conversation was confined to the adorable thing his 2 year old had said that morning. His wife, during the ladies' hour, confided that she was going to name her next child Little Boy.

So, Mr. Watson, I can tell you there's no need to worry. Indiscretion has been practically wiped out in the executive branch. And your log of incoming calls would be cut right down to a splinter if you could persuade your boss to hold regular press conferences.

Sincerely yours,

Yellow Rose.

As the Twig Is Bent—Safeguarding the Spiritual-Moral Well-being of Young Americans in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the February issue of Together, the magazine for Methodist families, carries an article by Col. Harry M. Archer which highlights the provisions being made by our military services for safeguarding the spirtual-moral well-being of young Americans in uniform.

Colonel Archer, a 20-year Army veteran, outlines clearly the factors in a young man's life which provide the keys to what kind of soldier and later, what kind of civilian, he will become.

Because of the importance of this article to those thousands of families who have sons in uniform I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

As the Twig Is Bent

(By Harry C. Archer, colonel, U.S. Army)

Strange names once again are spreading across American headlines and creeping into the American vocabulary: Da Nang, Vietcong, and the Ho Chi Minh Trail. They are familiar because tens of thousands of our soldiers, airmen, and marines are pouring into beleagured Vietnam. The buildup of combat forces there has brought increased draft call and may lead to the mobilization of Reserve and National Guard units.

The demands of national security made upon the young men of our Nation are of obvious and direct concern to parents, clergymen, civic leaders—indeed to all Americans.

The first though, of course, is for the physical safety and well-being of these lads. No less important is the concern over the effects of military service upon their moral fiber. Will they be coarsened and corrupted? Or will they emerge as self-reliant, better citizens?

As a soldier, a Regular Army officer, I have my own views. To illustrate, let me present an imagined but not unbelievable case:

The young soldier was not particularly drunk when he left the cafe. Just happy. He had had only a few beers. The girl lounging outside strolled up to him and struck a provocative pose. They chatted a few moments and then, with a shrug, the boy nodded and together they set off down the dimly lit street. Ten minutes later he was dead. They had not meant to kill him, just rob him. But there had been a scuffle, and now the soldier was very, very dead, lying in a foul-smelling alley thousands of miles from home and family.

Would such an incident have happened if the boy had not been drafted into military service? Of course that particular incident would not have occurred, but what about one like it? Would he have been as likely to drift off in an alcoholic haze with some other such girl? Was there, perhaps, some flaw in his character from earlier days, or did the Army cause him to follow this path?

After all, everyone who has read "From Here to Eternity" knows what the military services are like—sex-crazed, hard-drinking, profane, and completely controlled by sadistic sergeants and incompetent officers. Such an environment is bound to corrupt.

Balderdash. Let me lay it on the line for you, parents of America. With but a few exceptions, the boy coming out of the military is the same basic product that you created. So you want a good, clean kid to come home from the Army? It is easy. Just put a good, clean kid into the Army.

I am not being flippant. I have been in the Army more than 20 years, and I have seen the American serviceman at work and at play in the United States and in nearly 30 foreign lands. Some of them started using narcotics while others started building an orphanage. One man dealt in stolen black-market goods, and the Army dealt him a dishonorable discharge. Another from the same platoon attended night school, receiving a high school diploma with his honorable discharge.

What made the difference? They were in the same army. Could the difference lie in the moral training they received before they came into the service? If it were not so trite, I would answer my own question with that old chestnut about "As the twig is bent." On second thought, I'll say it anyway. As the twig is bent, so grows the tree, and you had better believe it.

FOUR KEY FACTORS

In the military, there appear to be four main factors that determine whether a twig will bend or grow straight—factors that determine how each young man will respond to the challenges of military life. It should come as no surprise that all four are directly connected with the home and community from which he came. The things which shape a lad's early life also tend to shape his career in uniform.

Here are the four factors:

Religion: The truly devout soldier is rarely in trouble. Even those who have relaxed somewhat in their church attendance are good risks if they have a background of sound Christian or Jewish training. Respect for the laws of God and man, as taught by the religious faiths, is the firmest foundation upon which to build a good soldier and a good citizen. The boys who take part in church activities and who have learned to seek their chaplain's guidance seldom see the inside of a military police station.

Family: The products of unhappy or broken homes have some tendency to have unhappy, broken military careers. I do not mean that such a boy is an odds-on favorite to be a troublemaker. The vast majority of all soldiers serve honorably and well. Only a small handful is given dishonorable discharges. I simply mean that a boy who grew up with the love and guidance of two well-adjusted parents has a better chance of a satisfying career.

Education: The better the education, the better the soldier. There is a direct, almost invariable connection. The reasons are easily understood.

First, the well-educated soldier is assigned to better, more interesting duties. Often he is selected to attend highly technical schools which not only qualify him for promotion and better assignments but also prepare him for good jobs in civilian life. The educated soldier knows that receiving such opportunities depends in part upon his personal conduct.

Second, the better-schooled soldier has a clearer understanding of why he is in the Army, why there must be a draft. If he is stationed in Europe, for example, he has some knowledge of American foreign policy and of why our Government believes that U.S. forces must be maintained there. Knowing these things, he has a sense of purpose and accomplishment that is not fully shared by less fortunate fellows.

Last, he tends to associate with other well-educated soldiers. As a group, they are the ones most frequently seen in the post library, the chapel, the education center, and the craft shop—and more rarely seen in the nightclubs and bars that spawn disciplinary problems.

The girl friend: If a boy has won the love or affection of a girl back home, he is more likely to be a good soldier. If they are engaged, this influence is even stronger. A picture in the wallet, letters ending with little X's and O's—these are forces which never should be underestimated. The boy who wants a particular girl to be proud of him knows she will not be proud if his service is dishonorable. The lad in love is more apt to be economy minded. He saves his money for their future home, for gifts, or to squire the girl around when he returns home on leave. Such a soldier will spend less money, hence less time, in the cabarets that frequently cluster about military installations.

The letters from this all-important girl are a factor in themselves. If they are affectionate and chatty, speaking of familiar places and people, they are a strong link with all the more wholesome, desirable things in his life.

This matter of love is a double-edged sword, however. If the girl spurns him or turns to another, strange forces are sometimes loosened. While one boy might sit in his barracks to brood over his fate, another may embark upon a wave of rashness, turning to the consolation of alcohol or the arms of some other, too readily available girl. Which course he follows is determined by other factors of religious training, home life, and education.

Note that I have not mentioned such things as the soldier's race, social, or economic position, his national origin, or rural versus urban background. Perhaps statistical study would reveal that some of these are important, but in my experience they are not. Give me a religious, educated boy from a happy home with a wholesome girl in his heart, and I have a good soldier. I do not care if he is black, white, or purple, rich or poor; he will serve honorably and well and will return to his community as a good man and a good citizen.

FEAR OF CORRUPT INFLUENCES

Why do so many people fear the effects of military service on their sons or relatives? To my mind, the reasons are clear. In the first place, there are the newspaper headlines: "Soldier Rapes Teenager"; "Five Marines Killed in 100-m.p.h. Police Chase." How often do you see headlines blaring, "Salesman Robs Bank" or "Bus Driver Slays Rival"? Rarely. And it is not because all salesmen and all bus drivers are above reproach.

Exceptions are made, of course, when a civilian's crime is completely inconsistent with his occupation: "Choir Director Arrested in Opium Den" or "Bank President Charged With Shoplifting." As a rule, however, civil occupations are not headlined.

Why the difference? I believe it is because of the uniform. It provides a visible identity found in few other occupations. Policemen also wear uniforms, and I can well picture a headline proclaiming, "Policeman Slays Wife," but I cannot imagine one announcing, "Grocer Killed in Three-Car Accident." In short, I believe the headlines give a grossly distorted picture of the serviceman's standard of conduct.

There is a second, more concrete reason for parents to fear the corrupting influence of military life. After all, Jimmy did not smoke or use swear words before he went into the Army, and now he does both. Proof positive. Well, what would have happened to Jimmy if, instead of entering the Army, he had left home for the first time to attend some large university or to work for a construction company? Would he then have been less likely to smoke and say dammit? No matter where he goes, a lad will pick up superficial signs of toughness when he goes out into the world of men. I do not believe military life is any worse or any better in this regard than a thousand other occupations.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE MILITARY

It may appear that I wish to absolve the military services of any responsibility for the conduct of our citizen-soldiers. That is not my desire nor is it the desire of any officer I know. The service branches have a deep feeling of obligation to do their share in preserving and further developing the moral stamina of their men. The reasons are both idealistic and practical.

On the idealistic side, we in the services do not regard ourselves as being basically separate or different from the rest of the American community. As children, we, too, played marbles, went fishing, came home with bloody noses, and loved the smell of burning leaves. Putting on a uniform did not mean that we suddenly became indifferent to all but the military aspects of American life. We are citizens as well as soldiers, and we feel civic as well as military obligations.

To insure the protection of our Nation, the President and the Congress have found it necessary to entrust a large number of American youth into our hands. We would be betraying that trust if we were indifferent to the moral, spiritual, and civic development of these young men. A great deal of time and effort goes into meeting those obligations.

Practical considerations lead to the same conclusion. From a purely military standpoint, we want men of strong moral character—for many reasons. The Army has found that the good citizen, with all that that implies, makes the better soldier. Of course there are some men without fear of God or love of man who also make good fighters. But military leaders prefer the soldier who is trained, educated, knows why he is fighting, and is convinced of the justice of his cause. Another, not inconsequential consideration, is the fact that the trained, disciplined soldier has a much better chance of survival. He lives to fight another day. This is not only a matter of concern to the individual soldier but also to his commander, who knows that one man with one weapon may spell the difference between defeat and victory.

Again, from a purely practical standpoint, it takes literally thousands of dollars to take a raw recruit and change him into a trained soldier. Our military and civilian superiors demand that we get the best in military posture out of each dollar provided by the taxpayers. We do not want that expensive soldier to spend 1 single hour in confinement.

At the relatively small post where I now am stationed are two chapels, a library, three clubs, a craft shop, an education center, a post exchange, a gymnasium, skeet shooting and golf driving ranges, a bowling alley, a theater, and a baseball diamond. Why all this? It is to give each soldier wholesome outlets for his spare time, to attract him to stay on post rather than to seek outside diversions.

These facilities, by themselves, would not accomplish the purpose. There must be the human touch. From the time an inductee enters the Army until he leaves, there is frequent counseling and guidance by his unit commander, chaplain, and senior noncommissioned officers. There are regularly scheduled training periods for character development, lectures on social diseases, and discussions of world events and national policies. My battalion commanders (lieutenant colonels) personally speak at least once a month to every man in their command about standards of conduct. Their company commanders do the same once a week.

The Army commander in my area, a four-star general, has made it abundantly clear to all his subordinates that he considers control of the soldiers' conduct, both on duty and off, one of the big indications of a commander's competence.

In times past, I can recall occasions when the armed services have been forced to take positions that ran counter to the social and economic desires of the civilian community. Young men have been taken from their homes and jobs to serve in uniform. Nike missile sites have been built on land needed for other facilities. Tax funds which might have built schools and roads have been diverted to buy planes, tanks, and ships. In today's world, these things are unfortunate but unavoidable.

But on the matter of the moral fiber of America's young men, there is no conflict of military and civilian aims. We in the military hope to obtain decent, intelligent, civic-minded youths to serve with those of us who have chosen a career in uniform. We hope to return them to their homes changed, if at all, for the better.

VFW Leader Supports YAF Light-Up-for-Freedom Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to participate with many distinguished Americans in a great patriotic rally in Constitution Hall on January 8.

The historic event was sponsored by the Young Americans for Freedom and expressed broad support for U.S. policy in Vietnam.

I insert under unanimous consent the speech delivered by Hon. James E. Van Zandt, former Member of Congress and past commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VFW LEADER SUPPORTS YAF LIGHT-UP-FOR-FREEDOM RALLY

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States—an organization of 1,300,000 oversea veterans of America's wars—is honored in being invited to participate in this Light-Up-for-Freedom rally.

The VFW wishes to commend most highly the Young Americans for Freedom in sponsoring this freedom rally—which has brought together a group of distinguished Americans who are participating in this evening's program.

By their presence—they are joining you loyal Americans, in the audience—and in similar audiences throughout the Nation—in telling the world that the overwhelming majority of American people are behind our fighting men in Vietnam.

The position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in support of U.S. policy in Vietnam was expressed in a recent statement by Andy Borg—present commander in chief of the VFW—when he said:

"Everyone is entitled to express his own opinion—but we deplore the spectacle of ill-informed and irresponsible persons proclaiming the Communist line against our Government.

"The so-called student demonstrators are stupidly playing the role of dupes for the Reds.

"Certainly they are not mature loyal American thinkers."

Recently Commander in Chief Borg returned from a visit with our troops in Vietnam.

He declared that the American fighting men—carrying on the battle in that little country—are magnificent in their spirit.

He said they are dedicated to the cause—and waging an effective war against the Communist enemies.

While in Vietnam he told the American servicemen there that the overwhelming majority of the American people are solidly in support of them—and of the cause for which they are battling.

What Andy Borg said to our men in Vietnam brings us right back to the spirit of this fredom rally.

It is unfortunate that today we have beatniks and other critics who demonstrate against our Government's anti-Communist policy.

We also have the draft card burners, and the misguided college professors, and students preaching what literally has been termed "insurrection against our Government."

The veterans of this country have fought wars in defense of the right of free speech and law and order.

They join the vast majority of the American people in condemning the handful of misguided Americans who preach civil disobedience which borders on treason.

Those of us who are veterans have been trying for years to cultivate and maintain a deep respect for American ideals—as exemplified by the flag of our country—and defended by the blood of American patriots.

That is why we veterans join other red-blooded Americans in Americanism programs—such as this freedom rally—in a counterattack to the anti-American demonstrations that are looked upon with scorn by every right-thinking citizen who treasures his American citizenship.

A young soldier in Vietnam recently wrote a long letter to his parents about these demonstrations, and I should like to quote a few sentences. He said:

"I'm really confused. It's my generation that's causing the trouble, and I don't understand them. Yet I think maybe it could be the little things. What has become of the Fourth of July parade and Veteran's Day parade and celebration?"

My answer to this young soldier is that he is not alone in his confusion.

The great majority of American citizens are likewise confused and ashamed of the brazen conduct of the beatnik-peacenik draft card burners.

The spectacle of pickets and sitdown demonstrations, in and in front of the White House and in Government departments in Washington, are causing the American people to realize that the American concept of law and order is being replaced by something alien, strange, and threatening.

Recently former President Dwight D. Eisenhower expressed concern about the dangerous doctrine that if you don't like a law, you don't have to obey it.

An overwhelming majority of the American people concur in former President Eisenhower's denunciation of the doctrine.

This doctrine of civil disobedience has been described as having been "perpetrated by a school of rebellion with a curriculum of chaos and a swelling student body crying 'Revolution.' "

It is heartening to know that in the past several months, all over America red-blooded Americans have banded together as we have tonight, in heeding the advice of former President Eisenhower when he said that someone should "start a crusade to win respect for law and order."

These countless demonstrations for Americanism that have been and are being held across the Nation are a fitting answer to those who preach civil disobedience and contempt for law and order.

In addition, these programs proclaim to the world that the overwhelming majority of the American people are behind our fighting men in Vietnam.

Yes, these programs and this evening's freedom rally, are an answer to the ranting and raving bearded radicals, and long-haired social rebels who do not speak for the American people, but instead have earned their scorn.

As I recall the young soldier's letter to his parents and the depth of his confusion over the conduct of his generation, there is encouragement in the fact that the great majority of young Americans, given the chance, make excellent account of themselves in peace and in war.

To this young soldier I can only reply that these beatnik-peacenik demonstrations are to be regretted.

Yet, by awakening America, they recall to mind the words of Edmund Burke when he said:

"The most wonderful things are brought about in many instances by the most contemptible instruments."

Health Care Extended in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last year under Public Law 89–97, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, Congress added a new title XIX to the Social Security Act providing an improved and more effective Kerr-Mills medical assistance program for the aged and extending its provisions to additional needy persons of other age groups. States were given 5 years to apply for participation in this beneficial new Federal-State grant program.

I am pleased to report that Pennsylvania's Scranton administration promptly applied for such participation and has sponsored a hospital care plan implementing the program in the Commonwealth. Credit for Pennsylvania's prompt action must go to Governor Scranton and his able and imaginative secretary of public welfare, Arlin M. Adams.

The U.S. Commissioner of Welfare and the Pennsylvania Council of Industrial Organizations, composed of former CIO unions, have complimented that Scranton administration for quickly taking advantage of this new expanded Kerr-Mills program. I ask unanimous consent that two news articles reporting these compliments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Patriot, Harrisburg (Pa.), Jan. 5, 1966]

U.S. OFFICIAL LAUDS STATE MEDICAL CARE

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Commissioner of Welfare yesterday complimented Pennsylvania for its speedy action in putting into effect on January 1 a new medical-aid program for needy persons.

Dr. Ellen Winston, the Commissioner said: "The Pennsylvania Department of Welfare is to be commended for its prompt action in bringing to the people of Pennsylvania the benefits of the new federally aided medical assistance program which was authorized with the 1965 amendments to the Social Security Act.

"This paves the way for making high-quality health and medical care available to persons of all ages who could not otherwise afford it. The measure should do much to reduce the social and economic problems which are so often the end result of neglected health problems."

A Health, Education, and Welfare Department spokesman noted that the Pennsylvania program stems from the program of medical care for the elderly enacted by Congress last year. Included in the Federal program, the spokesman said, is provision for aid to State programs which help needy persons of all ages.

Under the Federal act, the individual States must take action by 1970 to be eligible for the Federal aid. A few States are expected to act speedily but some may not be in a position to act until the later years of this decade, the spokesman said.

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Evening Bulletin, Jan. 6, 1966]

CIO UNIONS PRAISE SCRANTON FOR SPONSORING PENNSYCARE

(By Douglas Bedell)

Former CIO unions here last night commended Governor Scranton for sponsoring the Pennsycare hospital care plan that became effective last Saturday.

Delegates to the Philadelphia Council of Industrial Organizations said it was the first time they could recall that a labor group had applauded the Republican Governor.

"It's a far cry from the old Republican Party of Pennsylvania when it used to operate the poorhouses and the poor boards," said Joseph T. Kelley, president of the PCIO.

A statement adopted at the council's monthly meting at Textile Workers Hall, 4th Street and Lehigh Avenue, said the law will remove economic burdens from "thousands of people in lower and middle income groups" who have been putting off surgery and other forms of hospital care.

"Recognizing the fact that the bill as we understand it gives coverage to millions in the State who heretofore had no coverage, and to many of our people," the CIO unions said, "we are supporting the Scranton Pennsycare bill."

The new law provides that the State will pay up to $25 per day for the hospital care of more than 2 million Pennsylvanians who have low incomes, are temporarily in difficult straits, or who run up unusually high medical bills.

Kelley said the endorsement of Scranton's plan "shows our bipartisan nature." The statement was passed unanimously by the 40 delegates present.

Kelley next lectured the council on the need to "stop the bickering" in the selection by candidates for political office.

One way to do this, he said, is to put office-seekers to the test of blunt questioning. He said CIO leaders plan to call in officials of the city Democratic and Republican committees and ask what they can do to get a number of labor-backed bills through the Republican-controlled State senate.

While noting that the notion is against AFL–CIO policy, Kelley said it might be time for local unions to think about forming a labor party here.

"If we in labor were solid, with the parties split as they are," Kelley said, "I'm sure we could name the majority of the candidates."

Both CIO and AFL union blocks here were embarrassed by the victory of Arlen Specter for district attorney over James C. Crumlish, Jr., the Democratic incumbent who had labor's official backing.

Firm Action Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLAND REDLIN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, the course of the Nation's agricultural policy is of primary interest to my State, the great agricultural State of North Dakota. Following the signing of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965, the Minot, N. Dak., Daily News carried a perceptive commentary on this subject. I request unanimous consent that this editorial, carried in the November 8, 1965, edition be printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) Daily News, Nov. 8, 1965]

FIRM ACTION IS NEEDED

In his last-minute signing of the new farm bill, President Johnson said he sees the need for a penetrating and long-term appraisal of the farmer's place in our increasingly urbanized society.

At the least it can be said there will be time for a relatively long look this time, because the new law will be in effect 4 years.

This can be called a fortunate fact, unless it turns out that the effect of the law will be a continuation of the virtually uninterrupted deterioration of the small independent farmer's economic position. In that case, 4 years might be too late for some.

The new bill has, we understand, some rather good features. Yet we remember that in the past 20 years the best farm bills that the Congress managed to enact have seemed to have all too little effect on the trend toward bigness. That is to say, the big farms have continued to get bigger, while the smaller farms have felt the pinch and many have gone out of existence.

Nobody in North Dakota, as far as we know, fails to recognize that the average farmer has to have price support and income stability. And as long as it may continue necessary to restrict his production of major crops, with wheat allotments that are very restricted, compensating payments of various kinds, call it subsidy if you will, must be at a high level. Unfortunately the programs we have had, and it remains to be seen whether this one is any different, have paid off in favor of the large operator to a greater degree than they have benefited the small independent farmer. That this is true hardly needs more proof than the evidence that the population of the countryside has declined.

Time and time again attempts have been made to reverse this trend, and to reverse it by the simple device of putting a top limit on the amount of the payments that any one farmer could collect from the Government. Somehow Congress has never been willing to take that step, and such a limit was kept out of this law.

Yet there is much to be said in favor of a ceiling on farm subsidy to individuals. If one were in effect, it is safe to say the big farmers would no longer find it profitable to gobble up land, and the little farmers would stand a better chance of rounding out really economic units. It would be easier for people who want to farm, and who like farming as a way of life, to establish themselves on comparatively modest acreage.

We share the President's concern that our deteriorating cities, urban sprawls, and city ghettos need attention. The present condition of life in the heavily populated portions of the Nation hardly can be reconciled with the conception of "the good society." Still, even a modern urbanized society hardly can be conceived as something separate from the open country, the rural and semirural hinterland, and the food producing land. Let our great cities and their suburbs bustle with productive activity. Let them be clean and safe for the millions who live and work there in tolerant appreciation of the benefits of modern abundance for all. Let slums and tacky, delinquent neighborhoods be abolished as far as possible. When city dwellers get the centrifugal urge for recreation, and go forth to view the rest of America, will they want to find the hinterlands desolate? Will it ever cease to be important to America to have a happy, peaceful, prosperous and well populated countryside?

Whether the President's new National Advisory Committee on Food and Fiber gives any attention to this aspect of the national scene—that is to say, of the value of a well populated prosperous countryside as part of the social economy of the Great Society—remains to be determined. The Commission is heavily loaded with professors and economists and merchandisers, as if its focus of attention might be on exports and foreign trade. These are matters that need to be considered, of course, if farm policy is to be geared to growth, as the President's statement said. We would feel better about it if there were on that Commission one bona fide producer who believes in farming as a way of life and who wants to see healthy, happy people making a good living on the land.

Having lived most of our lives in a State where Bill Langer's embargoes and decrees as Governor are not forgotten, we can't help wondering what would happen if the man of action in Washington, Lyndon Johnson, took this moment to issue an executive order to put that ceiling on payments to individual farms. The Congress having omitted from the new law any really stringent brakes on the race toward big agriculture, it might not be an unbearable step to have the President apply the brake by an interim decree, until the new commission makes its long-range appraisal, possibly 18 months hence.

The News is opposed to the plantation type farm operation, despite predictions of the Federal Reserve people.

While we have opposed the idea of the graduated land tax, as a last resort it is possible that we will be obliged to take a second look at this type of machinery to get North Dakota farming back where it should be.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner Speaks on the Improvement of Government Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at a U.S. Civil Service Commission anniversary ceremony last Friday, January 14, 1966, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner delivered one of the finest speeches I have ever heard concerning the renewal of Federal service. This ceremony was to commemorate the 83d anniversary of the signing of the Civil Service Act by President Chester A. Arthur.

The understanding which Secretary Gardner has of our present civil service system is apparent, as well as his interest in improving it so that we may have an energetic, stimulated, growing Federal service system.

Because of the excellent recommendations which Secretary Gardner makes in his speech, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Renewal of the Government Service[1] by John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

We are here to commemorate an important beginning and to honor a fine tradition. The Civil Service is one of our noblest social institutions and I am proud to have a part in this tribute to it.

But I have learned from long experience that it is not really necessary to congratulate institutions. They have built-in mechanisms for self-congratulation that are marvelously effective. Having participated intimately in the life of Government agencies, the military services, business firms and universities, I feel that I can make that generalization on the basis of fairly comprehensive experience.

So I am going to honor the Civil Service by talking about the goals ahead rather than the laurels already won.

First let me clear away some general questions. Is the Federal Government bureaucratic? It is indeed. But so are business firms, colleges and universities, the military services, State and local governments, and philanthropic organizations.

Is the Federal Government in danger of going to seed? It is in the gravest danger. But so are all other organizations large and small.

I think most of you know my views on the decay and renewal of organizations.

Briefly, I believe that most human organizations that fail in their missions or fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity, not because of faulty doctrines, but because of the internal decay and rigidification to which they are all subject. They get stiff in the joints. They get in a rut. They go to seed.

I know that many of you are familiar with my diagnosis of what brings that condition about. So I am going to limit myself today to a few brief comments on what I regard as the most important single line of therapy for moribund organizations. (Please don't be alarmed by the word "moribund." I believe that in all large-scale organizations at all time the processes of decay are at work. If they are lucky, processes of rebirth and renewal are also at work.)

Organizations go to seed when the people in them go to seed. And they awaken when the people awaken. The renewal of organizations and societies starts with people. And since the first and last business of the Civil Service is people, this seems an appropriate occasion to examine the problem.

Specifically, I want to talk about what the Federal Government does to develop talent—after recruitment. Recruitment itself is worthy of discussion, and there is a vastly better job to be done on that front, but that is not the problem that interests me at the moment.

As a society, we are pursuing energetically, almost feverishly, the identification and nurture of gifted young people in our schools and colleges. In contrast, we are quite haphazard about the provisions for their continuing growth after formal education ceases. That is true in every segment of our national life. Almost all organizations in our society today are competing desperately to get their share of the flow of talent. But few are developing that talent properly after they get it.

The still untapped source of human vitality, the real unmined reservoir of talent is in those people already recruited and thereafter neglected.

The quickest and most effective road to renewal of the Federal service is the mining of that untapped resource. It is not only a means of tapping unused talent and opening up new stores of vitality, it is a solution to the old, old problem of developing a Government service that is responsive—responsibly responsive—to changing top leadership. Vital people, using their gifts to the full, are naturally responsive. People who have stopped growing, defeated people, people who no longer have confidence in the use of their own powers, build bastions of procedure between themselves and any vital leadership.

Now how does one go about renewing the people in the Government service—or anywhere else for that matter? There are many sources of renewal, of course. One is the uninvited crisis. Wars and depressions bring a certain amount of renewal, though the price is far higher than sensible people are willing to pay.

Another source is challenge and competition, and in this respect our Constitution has built-in provisions for the renewal of elected officials. But appointive officials, not facing the challenge of an election, are denied that stimulus.

Another source of renewal is rapid growth. Very rapid expansion of an agency is apt to have a highly stimulating effect upon the people within it.

Still another source of renewal is the sheer vitality of top leadership. I think, for example, that President Johnson has been as vigorous, if not cyclonic, a force for renewal as we have seen in this Government.

But what about the more mundane things that good government administrators can do to renew their organizations? What about the good personnel practices and procedures that will insure renewal? I'm going to give you an oversimplified answer, but an oversimplification based on having observed the personnel field with a professional eye for 30 years.

I am going to assert that the best means of inducing growth, developing talent, and insuring continued vitality in the individual is change. The change may take many forms—a change of troubles, a change of assignment, promotion, living in different parts of the country, moving in and out of Government, sampling the different worlds that make up this society, serving abroad, serving in an organization that is itself rapidly changing.

It follows, I believe, that the single condition that would contribute most to greater vitality in the Government service today is flexibility of reassignment. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson pledged bold leadership to bring this about.

The size of the Federal establishment and the diversity of activities it encompasses offer unexampled opportunities for imaginative reassignment. With such an array of possibilities it is unforgivable that any reasonably competent Government servant should suffer in a job that does not suit his talents.

It is unforgivable that any Government servant should lack the stimulus to personal growth that comes with change. The individual should be allowed to move and the agency should be allowed to move him without damage to his status or his feelings.

Free, frequent, and fluid movement among all the agencies of Government should be the accepted rule. The ambitious or merely restless young person who wants to sample several different lines of work should not be punished or penalized. Restlessness and vitality go together. And especially promising young people should be systematically reassigned through several agencies to insure their growth.

---

[1] As delivered at the U.S. Civil Service Commission anniversary ceremony, departmental auditorium, Washington, D.C., Jan. 14, 1966, 10 a.m.

Beyond that there should be a great increase in the planned movement of individuals between the Federal Government and the other worlds that make up American life—the world of business, the military, the universities, the labor unions, agriculture, State and local governments. I have moved in several of these worlds, and I am continually shocked at their mutual ignorance of one another. That ignorance breeds both complacency and paranoia. Each of these worlds imagines that it is uniquely close to the moral center of American life, and believes that the other worlds aren't really quite to be trusted with the American future.

Of all these worlds, the Government service has the least excuse for being provincial. It should have the capacity to understand all of the other segments of society. Without that understanding it will not be able to serve them effectively.

I would also favor an overseas assignment early in the career of those young Government people who seek to rise to the top. We have gotten past the day when only those individuals who have an explicit "international" interest should think of going overseas. The work of Government at home and abroad needs the breadth of perspective acquired by experience overseas. Such experience is valuable any time during one's career, but the earlier it comes the better.

All the processes of refreshment I've mentioned are particularly needed in the case of professional, scientific, technical, and scholarly people. Government needs such people more and more. But it will neither get them nor keep them if it doesn't provide the opportunities for further growth that they value so highly.

There is no excuse for Government to lose out in the competition for talent. It has a builtin advantage over every other employer. The cynics would deny this but the truth is that talented people are attracted to Government because it gives them an opportunity to render service to the entire Nation. They come with the highest motives. They leave when their purpose is thwarted or when they begin to feel trapped. Government cannot afford to be inhospitable to these people.

The administration of the affairs of this Nation are complex and dynamic. They are going to become increasingly so. The Congress has just enacted a staggering amount of legislation which must now be translated into action. It would be hard to overstate either the magnitude of the tasks ahead or their importance to the Nation.

President Johnson made this abundantly clear in his state of the Union message on Wednesday.

Now, let me ask these questions: Is the Federal service capable of meeting this challenge? Of course, but to do so it must take some significant steps to renew its spirit and its people.

Is renewal compatible with the Federal merit system? It most certainly is. The merit system, now in its 83d year, represents a great advance in the personnel practices of Government. We are not about to return to a spoils system.

But tenure was not designed to trap people, to make them inert. It was designed to free them from the capriciousness of politics. They need both the protection of a career system and opportunities for growth.

We can preserve all the great traditions of the system and still maintain the vitality that is so essential in this rapidly changing and infinitely challenging moment of history.

Recognizing that the very size and nature of the system make it particularly susceptible to stagnation, we can make special efforts to build in arrangements for renewal.

We can turn the concept of tenure into a positive asset rather than a deterrent to the full use of our talent.

The momentum generated by the President and the flood of legislation enacted by the Congress have given us unparalleled opportunities to create new patterns of work and to bring new strength and vitality to the career service.

I am optimistic that we will do so, and that optimism is based in no small measure on the fact that one of the boldest innovators in Government today, Mr. Macy, is also Chairman of this Commission.

John Macy introduced this session with some kind remarks about me and I want to end it with a tribute to him. I think he is a superb example of the best that the Federal service can produce, and I am proud to have shared this platform with him.

The HUD Headache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of January 14 contained an article which I am sure will be of interest to our colleagues. The column "The HUD Headache" by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak brings to the fore problems in connection with our new Cabinet-level Department. The article follows:

THE HUD HEADACHE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Just 2 months old, the new Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is in danger of bureaucratic strangulation in its crib.

President Johnson's inability to find a top-level national figure to be secretary of HUD is a symptom of HUD's malady, not the cause. Bureaucratic caution and feuding has so constricted HUD's scope that there was no waiting list of applicants to become Secretary or, indeed, to take vital middle-level jobs.

The HUD headache is a severe example of President Johnson's problem in transforming Great Society legislation into Great Society programs. This problem, created when the administration ramrodded bill after bill through Congress in 1965, now is coming home to haunt the White House.

Actually, the HUD problem goes back to the Kennedy administration. Like many other New Frontier schemes, the 1962 proposal for a new Department of Urban Affairs was novel in approach but fuzzy in detail. It was conceived as a glorified version of the Federal Housing Agency, which eventually would cover many city problems.

After the Kennedy plan was decisively rejected by Congress in 1962, the scheme reappeared in 1965 in new form. Under the cautious hand of the Budget Bureau, the "Department of Urban Affairs" became the "Department of Housing and Urban Development"—its function limited to the city's "physical" problems.

Prominent Democratic Senators who backed the original plan were flabbergasted. Why confer Cabinet status on the existing housing agency when what is needed is a department to coordinate all city problems—including poverty and civil rights?

This question was lost in the 1965 bill-passing frenzy on Capitol Hill. Officials of the Budget Bureau and the housing agency cautioned Senators not to endanger passage of the bill by raising new questions (though the bill finally passed in the Senate by a 2-to-1 edge).

But a Presidential task force last month took exactly the same position as the critical Senators: HUD definitely should be more than a glorified housing agency. The still-secret report of the task force recommended that urban aspects of the much-harrassed Community Action antipoverty program be transferred to HUD from Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

An overwhelming majority of the task force agreed. Contrary to published reports, its chairman—Robert Wood, a political scientist from MIT—was with the majority. Yet the President turned down the recommendation.

Why? Because the task force became entangled in bureaucratic politics. One proponent of broadening HUD's scope was AFL-CIO Official Jack Conway, recently resigned Deputy Director of OEO who had clashed with Shriver. Shriver's allies leaked word that Conway and the task force were trying to undercut the poverty program. Thus, acceptance of the task force report would be a vote of no confidence in Shriver. The President was not prepared to do this.

Similarly, many task force members agreed with Vice President HUMPHREY's private view that the Community Relations Service to mediate racial disputes should be in HUD (instead of the Justice Department). But this decision already had been made by the White House against the HUMPHREY position, and the task force did not consider the question.

All this put the President in a difficult position. He wanted a prominent national figure to be secretary of HUD. But by limiting HUD's functions to housing, he severly limited possibilities for the job.

Consider Chicago Railroad Magnate Ben Heineman, wanted by Mr. Johnson for the job. Heineman was a member of the task force majority supporting an expanded role for HUD. But now, with his recommendation rejected, he scarcely hungered to come here.

Accordingly, the search for a Secretary returned to Dr. Robert Weaver, the Federal housing chief. The President is not high on Weaver. But political advisers told him that so long as he can't seem to get a big name, why not pick Weaver (a Negro, whose rejection would anger civil rights groups)? The President agreed, and named Weaver yesterday.

In prospect, then, is just a housing agency led by just a housing chief. That doesn't set pulses throbbing, as the first new Cabinet Department in a dozen years struggles to get out of its cradle.

Prime Minister Shastri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1966, death suddenly claimed a noble and dedicated statesman and leader of his people, Lal Bahadur Shastri, Prime Minister of India.

He was handed the reins of state in India under difficult and trying circumstances. There is no doubt as to his effectiveness and capacity as leader during his brief tenure as Prime Minister.

Beset by internal and international difficulties which might have caused a lesser man to waver, Mr. Shastri met each challenge with courage, conviction, and strength.

His wisdom and compassion in dealing with other nations was well known.

Death abruptly halted him in the pursuit of two goals he seemed to hold above all others: the quest for peace and the internal progress of India. The agreement he signed along with President Ayub Khan of Pakistan a few hours before his tragic death was his final act of service to his beloved country.

The burden of India's hundreds of millions is now on the shoulders of acting Prime Minister Gulzzarilal Nanda. It is my sincere hope and belief that the people of India will unite behind him and assist him in providing Indians with the good life for which Mr. Shastri worked so hard.

Let all of us who are in positions of leadership pledge ourselves to bring to fruition the world without war to which Mr. Shastri's life was so firmly committed.

He rendered faithful and honorable service to India and to the world. His counsel and inspiration have left an aching void in the hall of the world's statesmen. I take this opportunity to join the many persons for whom his passing was a grievous and shocking blow.

Florida Applauds Dr. Robert C. Wood, Under Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, all of Florida, and especially Jacksonville, Fla., gateway to the Sunshine State, applauds President Johnson's appointment of Dr. Robert C. Wood as Under Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dr. Wood, 42, head of the political science department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, came to Jacksonville with his family when he was 18 months old. He attended the Duval County public schools and then entered the infantry in World War II. Since that time he has distinguished himself as one of the outstanding planners and thinkers in the urban development field.

I congratulate President Johnson for his appointment of Dr. Wood, and wish this brilliant young man from Jacksonville, Fla., great success in his difficult and challenging position. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles from the Florida Times-Union, published in Jacksonville, Fla.

EXECUTIVE COMMAND: WHITE HOUSE CALL PUT WOOD ON WAY TO POST

(By Joe Sigler)

The telephone rang in Robert C. Wood's office at Cambridge, Mass., and the voice on the other end directed, "Get yourself and your wife and children on a plane for Washington."

It amounted to an Executive command, as the caller was Bill D. Moyer, press secretary to President Johnson.

Wood, a former Jacksonville man and chairman of the department of political science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, said the telephone call Thursday morning was the first positive indication to him that he was to be named No. 2 man in the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

ON TASK FORCE

Wood, however, may have been modest. As chairman of the President's task force charged with drawing up a still-secret program of organization for the new Cabinet Department, his knowledge and insight made him a logical candidate for Under Secretary—a post for which President Johnson nominated him during a White House ceremony Thursday night.

The nomination of Wood and Robert Weaver, named to head the department, are expected to be confirmed by the Senate next week.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development will be responsible in part for helping local governments face and solve their mounting problems.

Wood, a political scientist with four college degrees, told the Times-Union that his first interest in urban affairs started in Florida, when he was associate director of the Legislative Reference Bureau in Tallahassee in the late 1940s.

"When I first took the job in Tallahassee," Wood said, "I was assigned to the minimum foundation program," which involves State support of local school systems.

With his background in urban school districts here, Wood next went to Washington for 2 years with the Bureau of the Budget. There, also, he was involved in urban programs.

After he had joined the political science faculty at MIT, President Kennedy named him to serve on his task force on urban problems, and later President Johnson appointed him to the advisory board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

In one of two books he has authored, Wood has urged unification of government serving a large metropolitan area, but he said last night he did not believe that recommendation is specifically applicable to Duval County and Jacksonville.

Wood, who moved to Jacksonville before he was 2 and went through the public schools here, said, "I've followed some of your development there," and "the problem of conflicting units of government is not so serious in the South, with its strong tradition of county governments and large boundaries."

CITES N.Y. PROBLEMS

This, he said, is in contrast with the New York City area, for instance, which is caught up in the complicated network of 1,400 separate governments.

More important in Southern cities, he said, is recognizing that "local government is an active agent in economic development." Local government has to be active, he said, because it is providing "a bundle of services—investment in schools, housing and health—" that attract industry and promote the community's economic growth.

Wood said he believes that one of the primary roles of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs would be lending assistance to cities to meet this economic challenge.

Wood, who volunteered that he is a former Times-Union carrier, said he last visited here in March with his brother, Dr. Jonathan H. Wood.

He said he will not step down as political science department head at MIT, but instead will take a leave of absence.

He and his wife Margaret, a Bostonian whom he met in Washington when he worked for the Bureau of the Budget, and their three children—Frances 10; Margaret, 7; and Frank Randolph, 5—will move to Washington within a few weeks.

During his work while heading the organizational committee for the new department, he said, "I've spent every weekend for the past 3 months in Washington—at least that's what my wife tells me."

WOOD TOOK ACADEMIC PATH TO JOB

(By Joe Sigler)

A product of the Duval County public school system, who early in life struck up a love affair with political science, heard himself nominated last night by President Johnson as Under Secretary in the newly created Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dr. Robert C. Wood, 42, the nominee in the new Cabinet Department, moved to Jacksonville with his parents and two older brothers from St. Louis, Mo., when he was 18 months old.

One of the brothers, Dr. Jonathan H. Wood, a Jacksonville surgeon, was waiting at about midnight for his brother to return from Washington to Boston so he could call and offer congratulations. Wood is head of the Department of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, Mass., near Boston.

Another brother, F. B. Wood, is head of the Department of Astronomy at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. Their father, T. Frank Wood, lives in Altamonte Springs.

Wood attended Ortega Elementary School, where his mother, the late Mrs. Mary Bradshaw Wood, taught for many years, John Gorrie Junior High School and Robert E. Lee High School, where he was graduated in 1940.

On a scholarship—supplemented by money he earned waiting tables—Wood entered Princeton University, but left before graduation to enlist in the infantry in World War II. After the war, he returned to Princeton and earned his bachelor's degree in political science.

Wood received a fellowship to Harvard, where he earned two master's degrees and his doctorate in political science.

"He aimed all along at political science," Wood's Jacksonville brother said, "and he thought for a time of entering politics." But instead, he followed a different route to high Government office.

Wood served for 2 years with the Federal Bureau of the Budget, worked for a couple of summers for the Legislative Reference Bureau in Tallahassee and later joined the faculty at Harvard.

He served at Harvard until going to MIT, where he was elevated to department head in political science a year ago.

TAPPED BY KENNEDY

His knowledge of urban affairs resulted in his being tapped by President Kennedy to serve on his task force on urban affairs. President Johnson appointed him to the advisory board of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

Wood submitted to Johnson a still-secret report as chairman of the President's task force on the organization of the Department of Housing and Urban Development—the Department to which Johnson yesterday nominated him as Under Secretary.

Along the way, Wood found time to write, two books, "Suburbia: Its People and Their Politics," and the more recent "1,400 Governments," a study of the political economy of the sprawling New York City political region.

Wood also has been sent on several missions to Latin America and the Far East as an adviser on urban affairs.

In an interview with Jayne Brumley, a former Times-Union staff writer, now with Newsweek magazine, Wood commented on today's big cities—a problem he will tackle increasingly in his new Federal assignment.

"The American city," Wood said, "is not about to fly apart or explode. It works as an economic unit. The issue is not whether it's spinning out of control, but whether we can make it more attractive and more liveable."

Mrs. Brumley's article on Wood appears in the January 17 issue of Newsweek.

Mayor James E. Cummings Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, all of Maryland was saddened by the death of Mayor James E. Cummings, of Brunswick, on January 3. Mayor Cummings was a man of extraordinary energy and zeal, unlimited enthusiasms and untiring dedication to the city of Brunswick and the people whom he served. Before entering public office as a councilman in 1952, he compiled a distinguished record during almost half a century in railroading, and was sought for counsel on railroad matters even after his full retirement from that field in 1959. During his 12 years as mayor of Brunswick, from 1955 until his death, he led the city through a period of great growth, developing municipal facilities and, more important, developing a new sense of community pride and faith in the future. This pride and hope, carried in the hearts of his countless friends, will be his most enduring memorial.

I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress two tributes to James E. Cummings from the Brunswick Blade-Times, showing the great impact this fine gentleman had upon his community and his friends:

[From the Brunswick Blade-Times, Jan. 13, 1966]

MAYOR JAS. CUMMINGS DIES

(By Jim Bryan)

While we all realize that there is an end to life on earth even though few of us care to face the fact, and in the case of our mayor there were indications time was running out, nevertheless when the word got out about 1 p.m. on Monday, January 3, that James E. Cummings had died, it was almost impossible to grasp the fact.

The reason is simple. He was well loved, and with our human frailities, we have yet to learn to accept death of those we love.

Without a doubt here was a man whom can be truly called "Mr. Brunswick" and we have doubt whether there will ever be another to come close to this title.

Without a doubt he was the most distinguished looking and most popular man in this community. It is gratifying to know that many called him "Brunswick's greatest mayor" in life, because there is no doubt that he was.

Mr. Cummings was born in Weverton. His father was a prominent blacksmith. At an early age, like so many of his cronies, he took up railroading and when he retired in 1959, he had more than 50 years to his credit.

Other than a brief time working in Philadelphia, most of his railroading career was right here in Brunswick. For more than half of his railroading years, he was a terminal trainmaster. Even after his retirement, his advice was often sought in railroad matters by many who started under him and worked their way on up the ladder.

His political career began in 1952 when he ran for councilman from the second ward and was elected in a fairly close vote. In 1954 he ran for mayor in what is recalled as Brunswick's most hotly contested election. He won by a narrow margin of 28 votes.

In succeeding elections, he won all by one-sided margins.

Mr. Cummings was known as "the man who took Brunswick out of the mud" as he was responsible for most of the town's paved streets.

While he did not have any trouble winning elections, Mr. Cummings had his "downs" as well as his "ups." Most of his "downs" came from the fact it was difficult for him to say no to those who sought favors.

He loved people. He loved action. He loved crowds. Despite his age, no one probably enjoyed bowling in the mixed league anymore than he. The same holds true for his many attendances at local dances and all other activities.

Brunswick's youth baseball programs were close to his heart. When the Little Leaguers and Babe Ruthians were playing, it was a safe bet he would be present.

He loved Brunswick and was proud of Brunswick. He loved out-of-town visitors, whether they were kids or adults, and reveled in being able to show off the community.

When the Babe Ruth All Stars went to Norfolk, Va., Hornell, N.Y., and Bridgeton, N.J., he was present. He didn't miss an inning of the games, but when the games weren't on, he was out looking, comparing, getting new thoughts and meeting people.

There are very few people in Brunswick who do not have fond memories of incidents and relationships with him.

We will never forget what one man once advised his friends when commenting on life: "Do your job so well that you will leave permanent tracks."

Mayor James E. Cummings has left many, many, many tracks.

Mayor Cummings celebrated his 75th birthday last October.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Bessye Long Cummings, four daughters, Mrs. Mary Kathleen Crawford and Mrs. Roma Hebb, both of Brunswick; Miss Kay Cummings of Baltimore; and Mrs. Dorothy Bennett of Brunswick; two brothers, John Cummings of Frederick and Mahoney Cummings of Harpers Ferry; two sisters, Mrs. Mary Lou Stephenson and Mrs. Martha Stewart, both of Harpers Ferry, and seven grandchildren.

He was a member of the Brunswick Lions Club, the Knights of Pythias, Fraternal Order of Eagles and Loyal Order of Moose, all of Brunswick. He was also a member of Steadman-Keenan Post No. 96, American Legion, an honorary member of the Brunswick Fire Company and a member of the Brunswick Ambulance Company.

He served for many years as president of the Brunswick Community Chest, was a member of the B. & O. Veterans Association, the Isaak Walton League, Maryland Track and Grace Episcopal Church.

Funeral services were held Thursday, January 6, from the Grace Episcopal Church with Father A. D. Salmon and Rev. Ralph H. Miller officiating. Burial was in St. Marks Cemetery in Petersville.

A requiem eucharist was celebrated at 8 a.m. the same day as the funeral.

[From the Brunswick Blade-Times, Jan. 13, 1966]

THE MARK OF A MAYOR

(By Emkay)

The qualitative achievements of our late mayor will be a permanent monument to his energy and zeal as an administrator. His quantitative accomplishments attest to his ability to secure cooperation from sources not open to most men. No administration in our city's history can record comparable attainments of worthwhile civic projects that accrued during the past 12 years under Jim Cummings' determination and drive.

And there were many obstacles to overcome. A public official is either a Dr. Jekyll or a Mr. Hyde. His intimates and friends view his every act and deed with approval. On the other hand, there is always a group that looks with a jaundiced eye at every act and deed. No public figure would dare hope that he can please everyone. The ballots cast at an election pro and con prove the point. A mayor enters office under the critical gaze of the public. There is an implied challenge. How the challenge is met will merit either public approval or disapproval. Then, there must always be the small hard core who will see no good in any personality in any situation at any time. These, together with those with personal dislike for whatever reason, can be dismissed. They are ever present and must be tolerated. Mayor Cummings met the challenge and the total of his accomplishments gives the challenge to whomever is elected to succeed him.

We will miss for a long time the presence of the mayor. When he came to office he brought with him an abstract asset that cannot be measured in dollars and cents. It was never present before, and during his administration its value was enhanced. This asset is the respect the city's administration commands from the county government and the State government. As a consequence, the quality of our community is being recognized for what it is. Quite removed from the misquided and undeserved characterization that existed for years.

The mark of a major has been left by Mr. Cummings. It is indelibly inscribed in physical property and the civic pride of the community. His bereaved family can take solace in it. There exists today a community pride in our improved and additional streets, the ever expanding street lighting, the excellent school plants, athletic and playground facilities, the modern and adequate ambulance service and fire department, the efficient maintenance crews that maintain utility requirements and cleanliness on our streets.

The indelible mark of the mayor makes it implicit on the part of the community that it elect a successor not on the basis of sentimentality but on the basis of capability and civic mindedness. Unless this is done, the accomplishments of the past 12 years may deteriorate and the much needed civic projects already begun may languish for lack of leadership.

Who Gets College Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Sylvia Porter has written an excellent, concise, and to-the-point analysis of how to go about getting a college scholarship.

This often confusing area is made quite clear by Mrs. Porter and I commend her article to the attention of our colleagues:

Who Gets College Scholarships

(By Sylvia Porter)

What does it take to get a college scholarship? How needy must a student's family be? What factors, in addition to academic standing, improve a student's chances for a scholarship today?

This year one-tenth of U.S. college students—about 500,000—are receiving more than $200 million in scholarships to help finance their higher education. At a limited but growing number of colleges more than half of the student body is getting some type of financial assistance. Beginning next fall, another 140,000 needy students will go to college with the help of an additional $58 million of Federal scholarships under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Today college scholarships are multiplying as unprecedented numbers of students from middle- and lower-income families continue their education beyond high school. At the same time millions of American families in all but the highest income brackets are straining under the huge cost of sending their children to college.

COSTS SOAR

During the past three decades college costs have quintupled, and during the coming 10 years costs are slated to rise another 50 percent. Clearly the competition for scholarships will become even more fierce than it is today.

Generally speaking, a high school student today must graduate with a least a B average and rank at least in the top half of his class simply to get into a good 4-year college. The requirements are understandably tougher for scholarships. While a growing total of colleges will admit highly qualified students regardless of financial means and automatically extend scholarship aid if necessary, the tendency at these more affluent colleges also is to select strictly from the top 25 percent of high school classes and to demand at least a B-plus average.

But glittering grades are not the sole yardstick for college admission or for winning a scholarship. Even without a superior academic record these other factors can help tremendously toward a scholarship: a student's outstanding personality, a demonstrated capacity for leadership, an unusual or special talent (say in music, art, sports, foreign languages).

Special consideration is given too to candidates who have overcome a severe handicap or misfortune during their lives.

How needy must the student's family be?

"NEEDY" EXPLAINED

The gifted child of the very needy (in the $3,000–$4,000 or less annual income range) has the best chances for most scholarships. The new Federal scholarships are reserved exclusively for those who couldn't otherwise attend college.

But a rising sum of aid is also now available to students whose family income is as high as $15,000 a year—if the family has other children to support at home or in college at the same time, if the family has other burdensome expenses, or if college costs are especially high at the institution the child wishes to attend.

For instance, a family with four children to support on a yearly income of $5,000 is considered by today's colleges as in greater need—in terms of eligibility for a scholarship—than a family with one child and an income of $3,000. Even the $15,000-a-year family may be considered "needy" if there are five children to support and if the college charges $2,000–$3,000 or more a year.

While less needy students and their families are expected to contribute substantial shares of their earnings, savings and assets toward college costs, a family's total financial picture is now taken into account—and the amount the family is expected to pay is measured by what it can "reasonably afford." Today's student financial aid is designed to fill the gap between that sum and total college costs.

HOW COLLEGE COSTS AND FINANCIAL NEEDS ARE CALCULATED

Let's say your teenage son has superior academic qualifications that would put him in the running for a college scholarship. Let's also say that, while your family income is a relatively affluent $10,000, you have three other children, your savings are next to zero and you can't see how you can squeeze out an extra $2,000 a year for your son's college education. Would a college consider you needy enough for your son to win a scholarship?

This is typical of the quandary facing many middle-income American families as record numbers of their children head into college. The answers are important to students and parents—because a college degree is becoming a minimum requirement for many jobs.

Scholarships are generally awarded to highly qualified, B-or-better students whose families have limited financial means. The average scholarship is about $400 a year, but it may range up to $1,500 or more—according to the individual student's need and the actual anticipated total college costs.

How are total costs and family need figured today?

Here are basic guidelines just published by the College Scholarship Service, a nonprofit service of the college entrance examination board in Princeton which helps nearly 700 major institutions offering scholarship funds among students.

In calculating total college costs, the CSS includes not only tuition and fees, but also room, board, transportation, clothing, books, spending money.

In calculating family need, it takes these major factors into account: Family income, number of other children to support, the breadwinner's age and retirement plans, unusual financial burdens such as other children in college at the same time, an expensive illness, whether the wife works, size of debts.

The CSS also weighs total family assets—cash savings, equity in the home, securities owned, etc.—and applies a share of this total to the amount a family can "reasonably afford" to contribute. This share, though, is comparatively small—less than 10 percent—and assets up to $7,000 are not counted. If the family head is over 55 years old, even higher sums are disregarded.

The scholarship seeker himself is expected to contribute about 25 percent of his total college costs.

Typically, the student's contribution might include 20 percent of his accumulated savings each year that he is in college, about $300 in summer earnings each year (including the year before he enters college), plus about $200 in earnings from a part-time job at school.

Assuming your assets are limited and assuming you have no "unusal" financial burdens, here is what the CSS suggests you can afford to contribute annually toward one child's college expenses at various income levels and with various numbers of other dependent children:

Number of other dependent children

	None	One	Two	Three
Before-tax income:				
$5,000	$540	$330	$160	(1)
$7,000	1,030	780	550	$400
$9,000	1,570	1,230	920	750
$11,000	2,170	1,760	1,390	1,140
$13,000	2,840	2,360	1,930	1,620
$15,000	3,580	3,010	2,530	2,170

[1] No contribution.

These are just your suggested contributions. They by no means bind any college to provide the balance of the costs. But they do give you a general indication of what financial efforts are expected today from the student and his family.

They also indicate what many colleges expect to provide through scholarships, loans and student jobs.

HOW TO GET A SCHOLARSHIP

Assuming you, a prospective college student, are qualified and assuming your family is financially needy, how do you go about getting a college scholarship? Today more than 500,000 college scholarships worth more than $200 million are available to students the Nation over, and another 140,000 worth $58 million will be available to exceptionally needy students entering college next fall. But competition is stiff and if a scholarship is a financial necessity for you, it's vitally important that you take the right steps in the right direction, now. Here, from a recent guide on "How To Get College Scholarships" by Gene R. Hawes and other authorities on student financial aid, are 10 basic rules for the scholarship seeker:

(1) Decide on three or four colleges you might want to attend—without regard to cost—and for which you would qualify academically. If they're all high-cost colleges, add at least one lower cost institution to the list. Scholarships at lower cost colleges tend to be less competitive than those at the prestige colleges.

(2) Request application forms for admission and for financial assistance from each institution and ask for details on scholarships from each. Colleges and universities themselves are the biggest scholarship sources today and they administer many of the nonuniversity funds—private and Federal—as well. A request for financial aid will not affect your chances for admission.

(3) Explore outside sources of scholarships: One of the biggest—and most competitive—is the National Merit Scholarship program, for which most high school juniors routinely take qualifying tests. Also explore scholarships that may be offered by local churches, local governments, corporations, civic groups.

(4) Ask your State department of education (in the State capital) for details on State scholarships and other forms of student financial aid. Find out whether a State scholarship would restrict you to institutions within the State—if this matters to you.

(5) Be sure to take college board or comparable examinations when they are given at your high school—or if they're not, find out when and where you can take them. Results of these exams are required by virtually all colleges today, and your score will be a major factor in whether you win a scholarship.

(6) If the colleges to which you apply require it—and nearly 700 do—get a "Parents' Confidential Statement" from your high school counselor or from the College Scholarship Service in Princeton, N.J. Have your parents fill it out well before your college application deadline. This questionnaire on your family's financial position—and needs—

goes to the CSS. The CSS, in turn, will forward copies of its evaluation to each college you designate.

(7) If the college to which you apply does not participate in the College Scholarship Service, you and your parents will have to assess your financial means and estimate your aid needs. In making this estimate, take all college costs into consideration—including transportation, books, incidentals, etc.—and also consider your total family resources. Make the estimate realistic.

(8) Make sure you answer every question on your applications and send every required "supporting document"—photographs, transcripts, etc. Don't be careless.

(9) Pay particular attention to the part of the application asking why you want to go to college and what you expect to get out of it. It appears on almost every application and the care you take in answering could be the key to your acceptance. Be brief and neither exaggerate nor underplay your statement.

(10) Apply early—preferably as early as the month of December, if you are a senior. Each college has its own application deadline and this you should beat by a wide margin.

Agriculture Becoming Monopolistic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MASTON O'NEAL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in rural Georgia the Market Bulletin, like the Sears catalog, is a welcome guest in almost every home. It is published by the Georgia Department of Agriculture and read religiously by farmers.

The January 12 edition of the Bulletin contains an article written by Commissioner of Agriculture Phil Campbell who is not only a respected administrator but also a successful farmer. His experience, therefore, qualifies him to comment on the growing monopolistic trend in agriculture.

As a member of the House Committee on Agriculture I share the commissioner's concern over the small producer's plight. The farmer is fast finding himself in the same position as the producer of industrial goods.

The article follows:

AGRICULTURE BECOMING MONOPOLISTIC—FOLLOWING INDUSTRIES PATTERN

(By Phil Campbell, commissioner of agriculture)

Until 25 years ago a mule and a plow stock were the only things necessary for a person to become a producer of farm products. Even with the highest priced mule and a few other pieces of mule-drawn equipment, farm goods could be produced with much less than a thousand dollars capital investment as rentable land was readily available.

With the small account of capital investment required to become a farmer, agriculture has been more competitive than any other industry with regard to the number of producers until the last 4 or 5 years.

Today this situation is drastically changed. To be a farm producer in 1965, capital investment requirements are in the tens of thousands and even hundreds of thousands of dollars with a minimum for the smallest producer who is to support a family and educate children being not less than $50,000. In many enterprises such as dairying, the bare minimum capital investment is $100,000, with more substantial dairy farm operations being from $150,000 to $500,000.

For the first time in the history of American agriculture, economic forces are restricting and inhibiting production by limiting the number of producers capable of having the capital investment necessary to be a farmer today.

Until very recently the only restrictions known in America on agricultural production have been by Federal law and regulation under the Federal farm crop allotment and price support program.

Production of agricultural goods for the first time in America is in the same position as the production of industrial goods in that the number of producing competitors is restricted by the amount of capital investment necessary to be a producer.

In industry, very few people have the capacity or the willingness to put $500,000 into a shirt or pants factory, $10 to $20 million into a pulpwood mill, or $500 million into an adequate plant development for the production of a line of automobiles acceptable to the consuming public.

American agriculture has been moving into this new situation during the most recent past and will continue in this direction in the future with fewer and fewer producers competing. Those in production will be very large operators with tremendous capital investments and a need for large amounts of money for annual operations.

Many enterprises illustrate this movement. In the dairy industry the number of milk cows has decreased steadily each year for 12 years, while at the same time the population of the United States has increased by 3 million people each year. Purchases of surplus milk by the Federal Government, as a consequence, have dropped drastically and unless conditions change, there will be a deficit of milk.

Beef prices normally move slowly. When the prices do move up or down, they remain at a high or low level for a considerable period of time. However, several months ago when beef prices dropped drastically, the price did not follow the normal pattern, but went up in an unusually short period of time.

Converse to beef prices, hog prices normally react very rapidly, because hog farmers usually adjust supplies rapidly to the prices on the market. This is not true at the present time as hog prices have been extremely high for several months, and indications are that a downward adjustment is not indicated as rapidly as in past hog price changes.

Also net farm income realized throughout the United States is, for this year, approaching $14 billion after staying between $11½ and $12½ billion for several years. Thirteen years ago farm net income was $15 to $16 billion, dropping 6 or 7 years ago to the $11 billion figure and remaining there until recently.

The overall picture of agriculture is very bright for the next few years with the prosperity of the individual farm operator depending upon his knowledge, managerial skill and size of operating unit.

The Bloomsdale Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of racial tensions and determination of civil rights of our people, it is most helpful and encouraging to consider a plan for progress for our Negro citizens which is being developed in Bucks County, Pa., which is a part of the district which I have the honor to represent.

In order that all of us may be made aware of this practical effort for self-help, I request leave to insert a copy of "The Bloomsdale Plan" in the RECORD at this point. The outline of the plan is as follows:

THE BLOOMSDALE PLAN: A LOCAL APPROACH TO NATIONAL PROGRESS, PROPOSED BY THE BLOOMSDALE GARDENS-FLEETWING ESTATES CIVIC ASSOCIATION

INTRODUCTION

About lower Bucks County, Pa.

Lower Bucks County is situated in southeastern Pennsylvania, bounded on the east by the Delaware River. Its southern boundary is the Philadelphia city line, and it extends north to Trenton, N.J.

One-third of the Nation's total consumer market is within a 150-mile radius of lower Bucks.

This area "exploded" populationwise when one of the largest United States Steel Co. plants was built at Morrisville, Pa., starting in 1950.

Thousands of the incoming white families to lower Bucks County, in the 1950's, were accomodated in vast, segregated, planned communities, such as Levittown, and Fairless Hills. Both of these provided facilities for recreational, civic, and cultural functions.

During this same period, several hundred of the Negro families who settled in lower Bucks, bought homes in the integrated communities of Bloomsdale Gardens, Fleetwing Estates, and Magnolia Gardens. Others rented apartments in Bristol Terrace, a Government-built, wartime housing project.

Thus, geographically, the more populous Negro sections of lower Bucks adjoin Levittown. Two have Levittown post office addresses. Their children attend schools built principally for Levittown. They patronize the same retail and service establishments as the Levittowners.

There is, however, one large discrepancy.

Levittown was planned and built with areas reserved for churches, schools, swimming pools, and recreational facilities, plus a large civic center in the main shopping center.

The swimming pools and recreational facilities were situated strategically, within walking distance of the Levittown sections they serve.

As Levittown neared completion, its residents, for practical and commonsense reasons, established a public authority, as permissible under Pennsylvania law. Use of the Levittown recreational facilities was restricted to paying members, composed only of those who bought Levitt houses, and paid for the facilities in the cost of their homes.

The anomaly of several hundred Negro families, who have Levittown addresses, and hundreds of white families who were living in the area when Levittown was built, is that they are excluded from the highly publicized, quasi-public, tax-free recreational facilities in their own community.

The Levittown Negro families found the situation difficult, particularly in respect to their children.

Levittown boys and girls have swimming pools and sports facilities, cultural, and civic activities open to them from which large numbers of their classmates are excluded.

Local group acts

The Bloomsdale Gardens-Fleetwing Estates Civic Association was incorporated at Doylestown, Pa., the Bucks County seat, on February 13, 1964, as a nonprofit, civic organization. Its membership is composed almost entirely of Negroes.

Association members discussed their problems with the Bristol Township Commissioners, in which a large portion of Levittown is situated—Levittown is not a political entity—and they spoke with the Bucks County Park Commission.

Subsequently, the township commissioners, by resolution on March 16, 1964, gave the association use of a 2-acre-plus plot, in a 10-acre township parcel, for the purposes of constructing a recreation building and civic center.

The location is ideal as it is "off the beaten path" and within walking distances. It, too, can be reached without children having to cross high-speed highways which dissect the area.

Further, the civic center site borders a large, undeveloped county park area. Park officials have assured limited help in recreational development.

Quite understandably, because of the heavy demands which fast population growth made on both the local and county governments, no financial aid is in near prosepct from either.

Birth of the Bloomsdale plan

The Bloomsdale group, after many discussions with numerous public officials, decided to launch a "self-help" program for themselves, their children, and their neighbors.

In the scores of meetings which they held in private homes to weigh their problems, one point arose time and again. This was the lack of a sense of cultural accomplishment, and the absence of a strong Negro tradition, factors which marked the advancement of other American minority groups.

As an example, everyone had some scant knowledge of George Washington Carver. "He did something with the peanut," they would say when asked about him. But hardly anyone had a full understanding of his work and its value.

Another point, which forcibly struck the group, was the fact that apart from sports, and entertainment, the Negro seldom is in a "host" position interracially. Using their own situation as a basis, they asked themselves: "If we built the finest, largest civic center imaginable, would our white neighbors visit us as our guests?"

Without further qualifications, the answer was "No."

All of which begged the question: "What can we do to help ourselves, help our children, and at the same time, take a giant step to improve relationships between whites and Negroes everywhere?"

Consideration was given to the fact that a visitor to the United States arrives with a long mental inventory of the injustices and the indignities which the American Negro has suffered.

Almost all that the visitor sees and hears in his U.S. travels is likely to be negative, no matter where he goes or to whom he talks.

Similarly, the emerging nations represented in the United Nations, and composed in the majority by dark peoples, receive double-negative exposures to "The American Way of Life."

It was against this background that the Bloomsdale plan emerged.

"Good" to offset bad situation

First, the group will provide recreational and civic facilities needed by all "out" residents in their section of the Levittown area.

Then it is going to establish a "National Negro Achievement Center," to further local, national, and international good will.

In the center will be gathered originals, where possible, or otherwise prototypes, photographs, drawings, and mementos, together with graphic presentations of every American Negro, living and past, who made a significant cultural, scientific, or practical contribution, that has been shared by other Americans regardless of color, religion, or racial origin.

All of the center's exhibits will be presented with dignity, and in a positive and constructive manner. Further, to set it apart from the more austere atmosphere of most such monuments, it will be surrounded by vibrant, vital, and vigorous group activities of both young and old.

As the center's exhibits are developed, the collective material will be incorporated into booklets, leaflets, and pamphlets for national distribution. Their purpose will be to inspire, stimulate, and encourage all young American Negroes to profit from the examples of achievement by other Negroes.

Center literature will be distributed nationally through schools, libraries, churches, and existing Negro organizations.

Another important benefit of the center will be the training and preparation for leadership received by those planning and executing center projects.

On the local and county level, the Bloomsdale plan includes a program of plant, shrub, tree, and wildlife restoration and preservation. Upon completion of the civic center, everyone in the area with similar interests will be invited to participate.

Housing, industrial and commercial development in lower Bucks, they explain, rapidly is depleting former natural beauty and wildlife. A bird sanctuary and an arboretum are planned.

The association foresees big returns from this phase of its program. Such activities expose teenagers to experiences that serve as an introduction to rewarding careers—when supplemented with college training in agronomy and animal husbandry.

Another reason for the strong natural beauty emphasis, stems from the fact that the Pennsylvania Turnpike cuts through the area. They wish to make the turnpike traveler's first, or last, impression of Pennsylvania the best possible.

After equal rights, what?

In reviewing their own lives, Bloomsdale group leaders stress the need of Negro children for education, and more education. Also, they hold, the children must develop a feeling of belonging, and identifying with those who, with the same handicaps, did attain high cultural, scientific, or practical success.

Noting that the lives of young Negroes are devoid of even such fictional-inspiration counterparts as Horatio Alger, and Superman, they plan to present worthy Negro achievers, past, and present, as symbols of courage and strength.

We want our children to achieve, and thereby merit consideration, is the consensus of opinion amongst the parents.

Presently there is no national center dedicated to accumulative, outstanding Negro achievement, the Bloomsdale group asserts.

They agree that heretofore, and quite rightfully, the best efforts of many Negro leaders and organizations have been directed to the realization of equal rights. But, in the pressure of events, the emphasis on Negro achievement has not kept pace.

The Bloomsdale approach is to encourage more young Negroes to prepare now for the responsibilities inherent in equal rights. And to provide a cultural background from which they may draw the hope and inspiration needed for self-improvement.

From its wealth of case histories, which the center will develop, all Negroes will benefit. And, for the first time, their young will be motivated by specific examples, and have patterns to follow in setting their own life goals.

Support for the Bloomsdale plan started at home, with the residents of the four communities, and with the area's business leaders.

Nationally, individuals, corporations, labor unions and religious organizations, as well as philanthropies and foundations will be invited to help.

In this activity, the center again will innovate. It will ask all of its financial supporters to name Negro candidates who might qualify for achievement roles. This procedure will open up national and local recognition opportunities for larger numbers of Negroes.

National Negro Achievement Center founders see it as a rallying point from which only good, positive and constructive forces will flow.

Commenting on its Pennsylvania location, the group makes the point that such a center would be lost in Washington, or in other large cities, where there are so many attractions.

Also, they feel its location compliments the national historical interest, and the splendid traditions which mark the Delaware River Valley region, and the Philadelphia-Trenton areas.

Equity for Veterans Receiving Pension Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the plight of many veterans who are in receipt of both veterans pension and monthly social security benefits. The recent modest increase in monthly social security payments has had the effect of reducing or terminating monthly pension benefits in approximately 29,000 of these cases.

These veterans, Mr. Speaker, in most instances, received a social security annuity that placed them slightly under one of the income limits established by law for entitlement to a certain rate of pension. When the President approved an increase in social security payments, though slight, it was sufficient to put the veteran in a higher income bracket, thus reducing or terminating his pension payments. Though the amount varied with the individual case, I understand that each of the 29,000 odd veterans affected lost considerably more in pension than they gained in social security. In a typical case, the veteran received an $8 monthly increase in social security and lost $48 monthly in veterans' pension benefits.

Now, I am fully aware of arguments being advanced that the 88th Congress authorized a 10-percent retirement income exclusion for pension purposes and that the pensioner is receiving more pension in 1966 than he did in 1964. The fact remains, however, that their pension payments for 1966 have been reduced substantially from the rate they received in 1965. It is also a fact that the increase over the 1964 rate resulted from a general increase in pension rates voted by the 88th Congress. This increase would have been received whether or not the social security increase had adversely affected veterans' pension. Additionally, Mr. Speaker, many of these veterans were not on the pension rolls in

1964. They became entitled to one rate of pension in 1965 and then, a few months later, it was reduced substantially because of the receipts of a few extra dollars in social security payments.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I believe this group of veterans and widows are deserving of consideration. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill authorizing a 20-percent increase in the income limits authorized by Public Law 86-211. This bill then will not only relieve the plight of those who were adversely affected by the social security increase, but will recognize that the spiraling cost of living also affects veteran pensioners. This bill will permit a modest increase in income without affecting pension entitlement. I am hopeful that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will give early consideration to this and similar proposals.

The text of my proposal is as follows:

H.R. 12123

A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, in order to increase by 20 percent the income limitations imposed by that chapter on persons entitled to pensions thereunder

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) column I of the table in section 521 (b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		
Annual income		
More than—	but	Equal to or less than—
		$720
$720		1,440
1,440		2,160"

(b) Column I of the table in section 521(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		
Annual income		
More than—	but	Equal to or less than—
		$1,200
$1,200		2,400
2,400		2,600"

Sec. 2. (a) Column I of the table in section 541(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		
Annual income		
More than—	but	Equal to or less than—
		$720
$720		1,440
1,440		2,100"

(b) Column I of the table in section 541(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to appear as follows:

"Column I		
Annual income		
More than—	but	Equal to or less than—
		$1,200
$1,200		2,400
2,400		3,600"

Sec. 3. Section 542(c) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$1,800" and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,160".

Sec. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective the first day of the second calendar month following date of approval.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as a longtime exponent of national trade fairs I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial in the Washington Post on January 14, 1966, relative to what the State of Maine is doing to promote some of its food products.

Some of my colleagues may have had an opportunity to visit the State maritime ship the *State of Maine* when it was in port in Washington last May.

It seems to me that the initiative my State has shown in this direction is an admirable example of salesmanship.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 14, 1966]

FOOD FOR THOUGHT

The State of Maine has launched a project big with promise for international collaboration. To selected ports abroad it is sending a 10,000-ton ship named the *State of Maine,* fitted up as a floating restaurant, to demonstrate and dispense the good things to eat that Maine has to sell. Fried chicken, roast chicken, baked potatoes, french fries, shrimp, blueberry muffins, blueberry pie, and other products of Maine's farms, woods, and fisheries will be served to guests invited to the ship. A food tour is a sound idea. Nobody can fail to understand the message carried by a smoking platter of fried chicken or a blueberry pie. The men from Maine, with the hard sense that characterizes them, plan to nourish good will with something both substantial and delectable.

The *State of Maine* may have pointed the way to a new development in international understanding. We might encourage the exchange of information about good food—with samples. We would gladly learn about viands from other lands that tickle the palate, and we would happily share such food and recipes as our country can offer. Maybe the Peace Corps could recruit a few cooks to demonstrate their skill abroad—if food is not too mundane for idealists. On the level of the table perhaps we can reach understanding and good will that escape the higher reaches of political philosophy.

Murphy's Law Catches Up With L.B.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks with extraneous matter, I insert the following article which appeared in the Washington Post on January 15. John Chamberlain's article "Murphy's Law Catches Up With L.B.J." will be of interest to our colleagues. His article follows:

MURPHY'S LAW CATCHES UP WITH L.B.J.

(By John Chamberlain)

A lot of people have been shedding tears for the Republican Party, including this columnist. We have watched poor Ray Bliss bemoaning splinter groups and struggling to raise a few pennies for the orthodox organization in competition with the fundraisers for Barry Goldwater's Free Society. But maybe our sympathy for the Republicans is not needed. Maybe, at long last, Murphy's law is working for the Republicans instead of the Democrats.

Murphy's law is that if anything can go wrong, it will. Sometimes, as in the "Era of Good Feeling of President Monroe," the law seems to have been suspended. But Monroe had it good only for a very short time. His era was quickly followed by wrenching realinements of forces, culminating in the turbulence of the Jacksonian period. Lyndon Johnson, as the modern Monroe, has had a couple of years of consensus, which is another name for an era of good feeling. But suddenly the dew is off the rose and there is questioning everywhere.

The Vietnam struggle is the cause of this, and it is a cause that can only be removed by something almost magical in the way of peace. If this isn't forthcoming, Mr. Johnson is going to have to choose between the vocal leftists in his following and the more numerous but comparatively silent patriotic right.

It is hardly in his character that he would go unequivocably with the left. The Communists, the beatniks, the draft card burners, the ban-the-bomb unilateralists, the various groupings on the so-called new left, and such strays from the old La Follette Progressive period as Senator WAYNE MORSE, all sense this.

The result, given a continuation of an undeclared war in South Vietnam, must in the nature of things be a pullaway third party, a popular front manifestation similar to the Wallace Progressives of 1948. Already we have had hints to this effect; Yale's Prof. Staughton Lynd said before going to North Vietnam that radicals might do better for their cause by putting up political candidates of their own.

A Wallace-type left, drawing away from the main body of the Democratic Party, would not in itself guarantee defeat for L.B.J. candidates. It should be remembered that Harry Truman survived the Wallace defection and even a Dixiecrat revolt that coincided with it. But Murphy's law is really hurting Johnson more at this moment than it hurt scrappy Harry in his 1948 fight with Tom Dewey.

For Mr. Johnson is not only in trouble with the pullout-of-Vietnam left, he is also faced with grumbling in the ranks of organized labor. He might count himself lucky that Mike Quill called his New York City transit strike against a nominal Republican, Mayor John Lindsay. But, in the long perspective, the New York labor troubles must recoil on Mr. Johnson. Mike Quill's behavior has presented such a picture of labor arrogance to the whole country that poor George Meany, the honest and eminently patriotic head of the AFL–CIO, has little chance of getting a vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act's section 14(b) in this session of the Senate.

Unable to get their way on the symbolic issue of the State right-to-work legislation that is protected by 14(b), the labor boys, even those who follow Meany in supporting Johnson on Vietnam, are not very likely to deliver for Johnson candidates in some of the tougher election contests next fall.

Thus Murphy's law, in the absence of a magical peace, is working for the Republicans. Murphy's law makes the Republican worries about their own internal liberal-conservative split seem somewhat misplaced. Given enough trouble with the campus beatniks and the instigators of Watts-type riots, the Democrats of California may very well toss the office of Governor of California into the waiting hands of Conservative Ronald Reagan. Given the same type of trouble in Illinois, the Democrats of that State might let moderate Republican Charles Percy become Senator. It would just be a matter of the ins throwing the game to the outs.

So cheer up, Ray Bliss. You may not even need any money to become a miracle man.

The Late Honorable Herbert C. Bonner

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, while Congress was adjourned, one of our most esteemed and dedicated colleagues, Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, of North Carolina, passed away. I was saddened to learn of his death and to realize that Congressman Bonner would not be with us any longer. We shall miss him—I want to join with my colleagues in paying a brief but sincere tribute to his memory.

Herbert C. Bonner served in the Congress for a quarter of a century. Congressman Bonner was a great American. He served his country well; he served his beloved State of North Carolina well, and he served his district well and long and faithfully. As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marines, he was known nationally as the father of the nuclear-powered ship *Savannah*, and for other work directed toward moderning our merchant marine fleet.

I knew Herbert C. Bonner as a dedicated American, an able colleague, and a man devoted to principle. He had a keen grasp of the responsibilities of public service, and he responded to those responsibilities.

He will be sorely missed in the Congress and most difficult to replace. His legacy of service will live for untold generations as a monument to his dedication.

I extend to Mrs. Bonner and other members of his family my deepest sympathy in their irreplaceable loss.

The Greatest Blessing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, northeast Arkansas and the Nation have lost one of its builders. H. C. Knappenberger of Blytheville has passed on, but the great work that he has done in Mississippi County and for the rural electrification program in the Nation continues.

The January 11 issue of the Blytheville Courier-News, in an editorial entitled "The Greatest Blessing," comments on the good that this fine man did for his neighbors and for his country. It is a pleasure to bring this editorial to the attention of the Members.

My friend Knapp—as we called him—was one of the builders of the rural electric systems in this Nation, and when the history of this great development is finally written, the name of H. C. Knappenberger will figure prominently in its chronicles.

The editorial follows:

The Greatest Blessing

Last week's death of H. C. Knappenberger brought to mind the work which has been accomplished by that organization Mr. Knappenberger was closely identified with until the past few years—Rural Electrification Administration. Today, it is more difficult to appreciate REA just as tomorrow such 1966 marvels at the Interstate Highway System and commercial jet air travel will be prosaic as man reaches for the moon and great new ideas.

One man, who was raised on a farm in this area, even today calls REA "the greatest thing that ever happened to rural America." Of course, he may be prejudiced, because it may have been his particular chore to pump water for the stock (by hand) during those pre-REA years. Unless there is an outage (and these are rare) few of us realize the many jobs done by electricity. Most of those were done by hand.

Since labor on the farm was and is more arduous than it is in town, the absence of an auxiliary power force such as electricity made life on the farm at times almost unbearable. In reference to this area, REA must rank with drainage as the greatest thing that happened to the farm family. It may be assumed that without drainage, many farms could not have enjoyed the fruits of REA.

You must imagine the physical difficulties of preelectricity farm days in order to appreciate REA. "At nights in the summer," one ex-farm boy recalls, "I'd lie in bed in one spot until the perspiration from my back had soaked the sheet. Then I'd turn. The evaporation of the perspiration would give me a few minutes of coolness and in between turns I'd get a little sleep." The cream separator was turned by hand, the housewife cooked and kept house without even the simplest electrical help * * * and this included washing clothes for the men-folks who were slogging around in that buckshot soil.

REA here was formed in 1936 when 147 farmers asked for the power to serve Number Nine, Gosnell (then, an out-country community), 40 & 8, Promised Land, New Liberty, Half Moon, Manila and Leachville. Earlier in 1936, Arkansas-Missouri Power Co. built an 8-mile line to make power available to 48 rural homes, but for depression-ridden public utilities, the risk would not warrant the financial investment (all of it borrowed, probably) necessary to extend electricity to the wilderness which was northeast Arkansas and southeast Missouri at that time.

REA was not organized until August of 1938. It was at this time that Mr. Knappenberger was elected president.

Late in 1939, REA electricians began making connections to farm homes west of Blytheville. By mid-1940, nearly 1,000 families lived in homes which were supplied by electricity. You might say the Mississippi County farmer was getting ready to join the rest of America. He was about to enjoy a few creature comforts, after years in the mud and wilderness, humorous but damnably uncomfortable and unhealthy backyard privy.

Many farmers had already purchased electrical appliances. The greatest use the farmers of Mississippi County will make of electric power will be in the running of pressure pumps to supply water for the household and for watering stock. Many had purchased electric washing machines, electric ranges, radios, and electric refrigerators. Several farmers already had installed complete system of water works and modern plumbing.

All this, you understand, even before the first kilowatt lead westward toward Dell and the cooperative's first substation near the McDearman farm.

Mr. Knappenberger and those other REA pioneers brought a great gift to the rural family of the 1930's. Not one person who was old enough at the time to recall these pre-REA days on the farm around here ever will forget the advent of electricity to their home.

It had a profound effect on the people, their self-respect and on the economy of this region—and on Blytheville in particular.

It is another example of people helping themselves by helping others.

I Am the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I was recently moved by a statement entitled "I Am the Nation," which was published by the Norfolk & Western Railway and under unanimous consent ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

I Am the Nation

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the Nation.

I am 195 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys, and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the *Maine*, and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Fields, on the rock of Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Korea, and in the steaming jungle of Vietnam.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheatlands of Kansas, and the granite hills of Vermont, I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate, and the Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac.*

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific; my arms reach out to embrace Alaska and Hawaii; 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of "Auld Lang Syne" as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the world's series. I am 130,000 schools and colleges, and 320,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium, and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney, Albert Einstein, and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Jonas Salk.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman, and Thomas Paine.

Yes; I am the Nation, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage, and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

This is my wish, my goal, my prayer in this year of 1966—190 years after I was born.

Mr. Johnson Suddenly Found His Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, January 15, which points up very well the very strange behavior of the President during the recent crippling, illegal transit strike in New York City.

POLITICS, THE L.B.J. WAY

Through all the 12 days that New York was crippled by a transit strike called in defiance of law and court order President Johnson had not a word of condemnation for the union leaders responsible for this exercise in economic blackmail of a city. Now that the siege has been lifted with a costly settlement, Mr. Johnson suddenly finds his voice, and censures New York for paying too high a price for its freedom.

The President is quite right in stating that the peace terms breach his anti-inflation guidelines. As we observed in these columns yesterday, none of the adroit arguments advanced in support of the pact by Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger, chairman of Mayor Lindsay's special mediation board, could make it fit inside even an elastic interpretation of the guidelines. It was a compromise accommodation made under duress; and only the mayors' resolve not to "capitulate before the lawless demands of a single power-group" prevented outright surrender.

If Mr. Johnson had seriously wanted to act against an inflationary settlement, he had ample opportunity to do so. On any 1 of the 12 days he could have denounced the strike as a threat to the national interest—which the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, now acknowledges it was—and he could have supported Mr. Lindsay in the mayor's unheeded call for arbitration, factfinding or a retroactive contract extension. But the President did not choose to do so.

Such help from Mr. Johnson would have been doubly meaningful in the light of attempts by some elements in the old-time Democratic-labor cabal in this city to exploit the strike as an instrument for humiliating the new Republican-fusion Mayor, thus hoping to kill his future political career.

Now that Mr. Lindsay and the city have survived the strike, the President contributes his need toward discrediting the settlement. The blatantly political character of his comment is underscored by the continued absence of any direct criticism of the Transport Workers Union for its coercion of the community. He declares himself "quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long"; but there is not a hint of who is to blame. Not a word about flouting the law and the courts, not a syllable about the damage to the moral and judicial structure of this, the largest city in the United States.

The President's remarks provide a discouraging setting for the recommendations he has promised to send to Congress to protect the public interest against such strikes. Reports from Washington indicate that his state of the Union pledge of tighter strike curbs was toned down before delivery in response to objections voiced by George Meany. If even the promise must be diluted before it gets to Capitol Hill, what real hope is there in this administration for effective protection for the public against public-service strikes?

The Late Honorable John Taber

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Taber, a distinguished former Member of the Congress, passed away while Congress stood in adjournment. It is my purpose today to pay a brief but sincere tribute to the memory of John Taber whose courage and adherence to principle stand unsurpassed in the Congress.

When I first came to Congress—the 80th Congress—John Taber was the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. I admired him then and later served with Congressman Taber as a member of this committee. My respect and admiration for Congressman Taber continued to grow. We disagreed at times but in disagreement I never failed to respect my colleague.

He stood forthrightly for what he believed—and he believed in the positions he took. Congressman Taber stood for fiscal responsibility and he espoused what he consider to be sound budgetary principles.

He was a colleague for whom all of us who served with him had the highest regard. His integrity was of the highest degree and his devotion to his district, to his State and to the Nation was absolute.

John Taber was a dedicated American, a patriot, a servant of the people, a friend, and a devoted believer in this great institution, the Congress.

He served long and he served well, and was a stalwart citizen.

Democrats' Campaign Fund Reports Puzzling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 16, Mr. Walter Pincus, staff writer for the Washington Star, presented an article which I am sure will be of interest to the readers of the RECORD. His column "Democrats' Campaign Fund Reports Puzzling," discusses a situation regarding the Democratic campaign fund reports which prompted the President to make recommendations on how the reports should be handled in the future. There is no question but what the oversights pointed out by Mr. Pincus do present a most puzzling situation. His column follows:

DEMOCRATS' CAMPAIGN FUND REPORTS PUZZLING

(By Walter Pincus)

The Democrats are using previously unreported funds—some of which came in as loans, some as cash donations—to pay off bills from the 1964 presidential campaign.

As a result, Democratic committee reports filed pursuant to Federal law with the Clerk of the House show inconsistent entries.

Paradoxically, such entries in reports from President Johnson's own party highlight the need for "strong teeth and severe penalties to the requirement of full disclosure of contributions" that the Chief Executive mentioned Wednesday during his state of the Union message in declaring his decision to seek campaign fund legislation reform.

The President's Club—the fund raising organization supported by Democratic donors of $1,000 or more—reported 1965 receipts totaling $378,244. The club ended 1964, its first reporting year, with a surplus of some $3,000, giving it $381,000 in reported 1965 receipts.

However, the club's 1965 yearend filing itemized disbursements adding up to $939,238.75 for the entire 12 months, with almost $870,000 of that amount being spent between September 1 and September 15 last year.

Democratic officials were unable last week to explain how the President's Club report could show payments exceeding receipts by $560,000.

However, a former party aid disclosed that large amounts of cash which the club received during the 1964 Johnson-Humphrey campaign were not reported officially as being received.

During the 1964 campaign, Democratic workers in Washington were given per diem payments of $20 a day before taking trips outside the city. In almost every case, such advance funds were paid in cash. Even White House staff members were reimbursed in cash by the Democratic National Committee for campaign travel with the President last year.

Most of the excess President's Club payments went to printers, ad agencies, and Washington hotels to satisfy bills run up during the campaign year.

SECOND SUCH REPORT

The President's Club filing marks the second time a Democratic group reported spending far in excess of the funds it said it had collected. In its second-quarter filing in 1965, the Democratic National Committee reported it paid out over $900,000 more than it previously had reported receiving. Though officials at the time said this represented a "deficit," the amounts involved were payments made rather than bills still remaining to be satisfied.

Several other types of discrepancies marked the most recent Democratic filings.

Another fundraising group—the Johnson-Humphrey committee—closed out its activities last November 17, according to its filing with the House Clerk. On that day it reported transfering $8,000 to the Democratic National Committee.

That committee's report, however, fails to record receipt of the $8,000 in November or December, although both committees were operated out of the office of Democratic National Committee Treasurer Richard Maguire. Maguire recently resigned his post to enter private law pracitce.

In a similar transaction, the Democratic National Committee reported it transferred $6,524.69 on December 1 to the President's Club.

The President's Club, in turn, reported on December 1 it received exactly $500 less—$6,024.29—from "Salute to L.B.J." housed at the Democratic National Committee.

What happened to the $500 and where "Salute to L.B.J." fits into the fundraising picture remain unanswered.

Such transactions, however, are seen as illustrating the need for another of the President's campaign reform proposals—action "to prohibit the endless proliferation of committees" which obscure the handling of campaign funds.

Another inconsistency within the recent Democratic report involves the date of alleged payments. The President's Club report listed a September 14 payment of $12,480 to Volpe Construction Co., Washington, D.C., which built the stage and platform at the Democrats' January 1965 inaugural gala in the District of Columbia Armory. But a Volpe official said last week the check was received in June rather than September.

Similarly, Turnpike Press of Annandale, Va., which produced a series of campaign flyers for the Democrats, received a $5,807.04 check in July rather than September, as the Democrats reported.

By postponing the reporting date of payments, the Democrats can attempt to keep their publicly filed figures of receipts and expenditures balanced and thus give the impression of solvency at all times.

Another entry which has puzzled inquirers lists a payment late in November of $2,407 as "reimbursement of expenses" to a former employee of the White House travel section.

This now retired, longtime civil service employee said last week he could not recall ever having received any funds or checks from the Democratic National Committee. He said, however, the committee called him last fall and asked him his home address, which was part of the report filed.

There has been no official explanation as to why, almost a year after the campaign, the Democrats decided to pay off several of their largest outstanding debts and report those payments as part of the President's Club filing. Recent stories have referred to an alleged $1.7 million party deficit.

The recent filings would indicate the party still has unrecorded financial resources available to meet its financial needs.

One Democratic aid last week suggested President Johnson, faced with the need to replace retiring treasurer, Maguire, had taken new interest in the party's finances. It also was speculated that criticism of the Democrats' $15,000 a page ad book to raise funds for this year's congressional elections had stirred Johnson to action.

Who Gets College Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment of the Higher Education Act of 1965, I have had many inquiries from constituents with regard to the procedure for obtaining a college scholarship. I am sure that many of our colleagues have had the same experience. The following articles by Sylvia Porter entitled "Who Gets College Scholarships?" answer many of the questions that perplex prospective college students and for which answers are difficult to find. I am inserting this material in the Record with the hope that our colleagues and other readers of the Congressional Record will find it helpful.

WHO GETS COLLEGE SCHOLARSHIPS

(By Sylvia Porter)

What does it take to get a college scholarship? How needy must a student's family be? What factors, in addition to academic standing, improve a student's chances for a scholarship today?

This year one-tenth of U.S. college students—about 500,000—are receiving more than $200 million in scholarships to help finance their higher education. At a limited but growing number of colleges more than half of the student body is getting some type of financial assistance. Beginning next fall, another 140,000 needy students will go to college with the help of an additional $58 million of Federal scholarships under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Today college scholarships are multiplying as unprecedented numbers of students from middle- and lower-income families continue their education beyond high school. At the same time millions of American families in all but the highest income brackets are straining under the huge cost of sending their children to college.

COSTS SOAR

During the past three decades college costs have quintupled, and during the coming 10 years costs are slated to rise another 50 percent. Clearly the competition for scholarships will become even more fierce than it is today.

Generally speaking, a high school student today must graduate with at least a B average and rank at least in the top half of his class simply to get into a good 4-year college. The requirements are understandably tougher for scholarships. While a growing total of colleges will admit highly qualified students regardless of financial means and automatically extend scholarship aid if necessary, the tendency at these more affluent colleges also is to select strictly from the top 25 percent of high school classes and to demand at least a B-plus average.

But glittering grades are not the sole yardstick for college admission or for winning a scholarship. Even without a superior academic record these other factors can help tremendously toward a scholarship: a student's outstanding personality, a demonstrated capacity for leadership, an unusual or special talent (say in music, art, sports, foreign languages).

Special consideration is given too to candidates who have overcome a severe handicap or misfortune during their lives.

How needy must the student's family be?

"NEEDY" EXPLAINED

The gifted child of the very needy (in the $3,000–$4,000 or less annual income range) has the best chances for most scholarships. The new Federal scholarships are reserved exclusively for those who couldn't otherwise attend college.

But a rising sum of aid is also now available to students whose family income is as high as $15,000 a year—if the family has other children to support at home or in college at the same time, if the family has other burdensome expenses, or if college costs are especially high at the institution the child wishes to attend.

For instance, a family with four children to support on a yearly income of $5,000 is considered by today's colleges as in greater need—in terms of eligibility for a scholarship—than a family with one child and an income of $3,000. Even the $15,000-a-year family may be considered "needy"—if there are five children to support and if the college charges $2,000–$3,000 or more a year.

While less needy students and their families are expected to contribute substantial shares of their earnings, savings, and assets toward college costs, a family's total financial picture is now taken into account—and the amount the family is expected to pay is measured by what it can reasonably afford. Today's student financial aid is designed to fill the gap between that sum and total college costs.

HOW COLLEGE COSTS AND FINANCIAL NEEDS ARE CALCULATED

Let's say your teenage son has superior academic qualifications that would put him in the running for a college scholarship. Let's also say that, while your family income is a relatively affluent $10,000, you have three other children, your savings are next to zero and you can't see how you can squeeze out an extra $2,000 a year for your son's college education. Would a college consider you "needy" enough for your son to win a scholarship?

This is typical of the quandary facing many middle-income American families as record number of their children head into college. The answers are important to students and parents—because a college degree is becoming a minimum requirement for many jobs.

Scholarships are generally awarded to highly qualified, B-or-better students whose families have limited financial means. The average scholarship is about $400 a year, but it may range up to $1,500 or more—according to the individual student's need and the actual anticipated total college costs.

How are total costs and family need figured today?

Here are basic guidelines just published by the college scholarship service, a nonprofit service of the college entrance examination board in Princeton which helps nearly 700 major institutions offering scholarship funds among students.

In calculating total college cost, the CSS includes not only tuition and fees, but also room, board, transportation, clothing, books, spending money.

In calculating family need, it takes these major factors into account: Family income, number of other children to support, the breadwinner's age and retirement plans, unusual financial burdens such as other children in college at the same time, an expensive illness, whether the wife works, size of debts.

The CSS also weighs total family assets—cash savings, equity in the home, securities owned, etc.—and applies a share of this total to the amount a family can reasonably afford to contribute. This share, though, is comparatively small—less than 10 percent—and assets up to $7,000 are not counted. If the family head is over 55 years old, even higher sums are disregarded.

The scholarship seeker himself is expected to contribute about 25 percent of his total college costs.

Typically, the student's contribution might include 20 percent of his accumulated savings each year that he is in college, about $300 in summer earnings each year (including the year before he enters college), plus about $200 in earning from a part-time job at school.

Assuming your assets are limited and assuming you have no unusual financial burdens, here is what the CSS suggests you can afford to contribute annually toward one child's college expenses at various income levels and with various numbers of other dependent children:

Number of other dependent children

	None	One	Two	Three
Before-tax income:				
$5,000	$540	$330	$160	[1]
$7,000	1,030	780	550	$400
$9,000	1,570	1,230	920	750
$11,000	2,170	1,760	1,390	1,140
$13,000	2,840	2,360	1,930	1,620
$15,000	3,580	3,010	2,530	2,170

[1] No contribution.

These are just your "suggested" contributions. They by no means bind any college to provide the balance of the costs. But they do give you a general indication of what financial efforts are expected today from the student and his family.

They also indicate what many colleges expect to provide through scholarships, loans, and student jobs.

HOW TO GET A SCHOLARSHIP

Assuming you, a prospective college student, are qualified and assuming your family is financially needy, how do you go about getting a college scholarship? Today more than 500,000 college scholarships worth more than $200 million are available to students the Nation over, and another 140,000 worth $55 million will be available to exceptionally needy students entering college next fall. But competition is stiff and if a scholarship is a financial necessity for you, it's vitally important that you take the right steps in the right direction—now. Here, from a recent guide on "How To Get College Scholarships," by Gene R. Hawes and other authorities on student financial aid, are 10 basic rules for the scholarship seeker:

(1) Decide on three or four colleges you might want to attend, without regard to cost, and for which you would qualify academically. If they're all high-cost colleges, add at least one lower cost institution to the list. Scholarships at lower cost colleges tend to be less competitive than those at the "prestige" colleges.

(2) Request application forms for admission and for financial assistance from each institution and ask for details on scholarships from each. Colleges and universities themselves are the biggest scholarship sources today, and they administer many of the nonuniversity funds, private and Federal, as well. A request for financial aid will not affect your chances for admission.

(3) Explore "outside" sources of scholarships: One of the biggest—and most competitive—the National Merit Scholarship program, for which most high school juniors routinely take qualifying tests. Also explore scholarships that may be offered by local churches, local governments, corporations, civic groups.

(4) Ask your State department of education (in the State capital) for details on State scholarships and other forms of student financial aid. Find out whether a State scholarship would restrict you to institutions within the State—if this matters to you.

(5) Be sure to take college board or comparable examinations when they are given at your high school—or if they're not, find out when and where you can take them. Results of these exams are required by virtually all colleges today, and your score will be a major factor in whether you win a scholarship.

(6) If the colleges to which you apply require it—and nearly 700 do—get a "parents' confidential statement" from your high school counselor or from the college scholarship service in Princeton, N.J. Have your parents fill it out well before your college application deadline. This questionnaire on your family's financial position—and needs—goes to the CSS. The CSS, in-turn, will forward copies of its evaluation to each college you designate.

(7) If the college to which you apply does not participate in the college scholarship service, you and your parents will have to assess your financial means and estimate your aid needs. In making this estimate, take all college costs into consideration—including transportation, books, incidentals, etc.—and also consider your total family resources. Make the estimate realistic.

(8) Make sure you answer every question on your applications and send every required "supporting document"—photographs, transcripts, etc. Don't be careless.

(9) Pay particular attention to the part of the application asking why you want to go to college and what you expect to get out of it. It appears on almost every application and the care you take in answering could be the key to your acceptance. Be brief and neither exaggerate nor underplay your statement.

(10) Apply early—preferably as early as the month of December, if you are a senior. Each college has its own application deadline and this you should beat by a wide margin.

A Needed Reform for a Better House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of our colleagues were delighted that President Johnson endorsed, in his state of the Union message, a 4-year term for the Members of this body.

I have sponsored legislation to accomplish this ever since 1949 and I urged it again before the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress last year.

Additional support now comes from Ruth Montgomery and I commend to the attention of our colleagues her remarks on this subject which appeared in the December 16, 1965, edition of the New York Journal American:

How To Build a Better House

(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—It is sad but true that under our system of Government, the second year of a Congressman's term is devoted more to currying his constituent's favor than to the Nation's business. The necessity of getting elected every 2 years keeps him running scared.

This is a poor return for the taxpayer on the $30,000 a year, plus staff and office expenses, to which each lawmaker is entitled. For that reason many Capitol-watchers, including former President Eisenhower, have become convinced that Members of the House should serve 4-year terms instead of 2.

The Faith of Freemen—Grand Cross of the Court of Honour, Brother J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on October 19, 1965, a great American, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the occasion of receiving the highest honor which the Supreme Council, 33d degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America, can bestow, the Grand Cross of the Court of Honour, made a truly outstanding address entitled "The Faith of Free Men." I believe that this speech is a message of such importance that it should be made available to my colleagues in the Congress of the United States. The message follows:

The Faith of Freemen

This is the proudest moment of my 45 years' membership in the Masonic Order. To receive the Grand Cross of the Scottish Rite is an honor which I shall cherish always. This award is made all the more meaningful by the high respect which Freemasonary commands in the minds of all who have felt its wholesome influence and observed its good works.

The strong virtues of the Masonic movement are indelibly etched in every chapter of our Nation's history. Masons helped to carve our country's early settlements out of a hostile wilderness that was Colonial America. They added vital fuel to the fires of freedom which burned so intensely from Boston to Savannah some two centuries ago. They stood prominent among the bold colonists who affixed their signatures to the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and, 11 years later, to the Constitution of the United States.

George Washington, the Father of our country, was a Master Mason—a statesman of greatest courage and dedication who envisioned America as a land where men of all creeds might live together and worship together in freedom under God.

The brave patriots who served under General Washington at Valley Forge—and their latter-day counterparts at San Juan Hill, Belleau Wood, Corregidor, the Yalu Valley—made grave sacrifices that liberty and justice might prevail. They fought then—as Americans stand prepared to fight today—to uphold a cause which draws its greatest strength from an abiding faith in man's ability to guide his own destiny with the help of God.

Today, our priceless heritage of freedom is under relentless attack both at home and abroad. In the jungles and rice fields of southeast Asia, Americans in uniform maintain a constant vigil against the Communist hordes of a modern-day Genghis Khan to whom no commodity is cheaper than human life.

In Europe and the Near East, our country's patience and determination are constantly strained by the taunts and provocations of Iron Curtain slave masters who talk of peace while clandestinely plotting to spread their godless creed of utopia-in-chains.

Throughout Central and South America, we have had to erect guardposts of freedom against the sinister efforts of Communist henchmen to spread the malignant cancer of Marxism across the Western Hemisphere. Not only have we seen the results of their treachery in Cuba, but the Dominican Republic could be a Marxist satellite today were it not for the fast action taken by a courageous President and alert Americans to thwart a Communist takeover there earlier this year.

Communism is a vast international conspiracy which today dominates one-third of the earth's people. Here, in our own country, that conspiracy is represented by the Communist Party, U.S.A., a bold and defiant band of anti-American turncoats whose operations are directed and controlled by the Kremlin in Moscow.

The Communists profess to be a legitimate political organization. This is not so. Actually, the party constitutes a foreign outpost on America's shores. Its members—knowingly, deliberately, and willingly—are active tools of the Soviet Union.

Witness, for example, the programs which occupy the primary attention of Communist Party members in this country: withdrawal of American support from South Vietnam; noninterference with Communist terrorists in Santo Domingo; appeasement in all dealings with members of the Marxist world.

The Communists speak of peace, but peace at an exorbitant and heart-rending price—submission to Communist domination. From 50 years of dealings with the Stalins, the Khrushchevs, the Brezhnevs, the Castros, the Mao Tse-tungs, this bitter lesson has been learned by the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Yet, in country after country, there still remain the legions of uninformed, misinformed, and politically naive who are the non-Communist dupes and fellow travelers whom the Communists rely upon to carry forward their programs for world domination.

We find these dupes in shocking abundance here in our own United States where Gus Hall, the Moscow-trained general secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., boasted to newsmen last fall that there are approximately 100,000 Americans within the party's influence. About 10 percent of them, he said, are dues-paying members. The remainder he described as close sympathizers.

These sympathizers include growing numbers of young people—because the major target of Communist propaganda and exploitation in the United States today is the Nation's youth.

Standing in the forefront of the Communist campaign to confuse the minds, distort the thinking and win the support of our young people is the DuBois Clubs of America—an illegitimate spawn conceived by the Communist Party and nurtured by a trusted band of youthful adherents to the cause of world Marxism.

Leaders of the DuBois Clubs of America were prominent among the Communists who attended a special youth leadership school sponsored by the party last June to prepare for a stepped-up campaign of recruitment and agitation among youth. Already, this fall, there are signs that these training sessions have begun to bear fruit—in the form of defiant protests against law and authority.

Today, as never before, the Communists are confident of their ability to win recruits among this country's youth. That is why the party has placed such intense emphasis upon its campus speech program—a program that has seen skilled hucksters of atheism and treason appear at scores of colleges and universities from New York to California, without objection by the authorities of those institutions of higher learning and often with positive encouragement by members of the faculties of such universities.

What do these party spokesmen have to say to our young people? In the State of Washington, one Communist speaker loudly condemned the United States for its actions in helping to defend the cause of freedom in the Far East. He charged his audience that it was their duty to demand immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

In Missouri, another party functionary told a group of students that the United States is the "most hated country" in the world.

And in Rhode Island, a third Communist explained that the wall of Berlin had been built to hold back undesirables from the West who were infiltrating East Germany.

The Communist movement, Communist regimes, and those who knowingly support them are really ultrareactionary. They are the worst enemies of freedom and social justice.

Our university professors and students would serve their country and professions with fruitful distinction if they were to study this historic development and become not only academic but dynamic fighters against the Communist drive to dominate the world and impose on mankind the Soviet system of tyranny.

It is one of the glaring contradictions of our day that the same Communist spokesmen who are so glib tongued in their appearances before groups of college students immediately lose their voices when placed under oath in a court of law or before a committee of Congress. They always take refuge behind the fifth amendment. Our moral atmosphere would be better if they knew as much about the Ten Commandments as they do about the fifth amendment.

Communists refuse to testify at any proceeding where they are subject to fines and imprisonment for deliberate lies and distortions. In the dark world of communism, there is no room for truth—just as there is no place for freedom and decency and God.

In their campaign to weaken and destroy the cause of democracy, the Communists actually are receiving invaluable aid from far too many intended victims.

I refer to the pseudoliberals of the extreme left, as well as the misguided zealots of the ultra-right—modern-day Don Quixotes who mistakenly fight the transparent shadows of imaginary enemies rather than meet the challenge of the real and awesome problems confronting our beloved United States.

I refer to the Ku Klux Klan and other hatemongers, regardless of their color or creed, who practice a doctrine of intolerance, bigotry, and intimidation toward their fellowman.

I refer to the unkempt characters of pliable minds and persuasion who eagerly attach themselves to any "cause" which runs counter to convention—and to the morally corrupt opportunists who flagrantly exploit their naive enthusiasm and credulity for self-serving purposes.

I refer also to the highly vocal rabble rousers of dubious stability and motivation who encourage defiance of the law by counseling cynicism and disrespect toward family, law and order, and all forms of authority.

"Civil Disobedience," a seditious slogan of gross irresponsibility, has captured the imagination of citizens who are morally, mentally, and emotionally immature. It has been spread at street-corner rallies by those who would use it as an avenue to personal power and prestige. And it has been spread in the false guise of academic freedom in the halls of public and private institutions that have permitted emotional, and often obscene, harangues against morality and reason. What they really seek is license—not freedom.

I am greatly concerned that certain racial leaders are doing the civil rights movement a great disservice by suggesting that citizens need only obey the laws with which they agree. Such an attitude breeds disrespect for the law and even civil disorder and rioting. The citizen has no latitude as to what laws he must obey. If he feels a law is wrong and unjust, he has recourse to establish constitutional procedures to have it changed through his legally elected representatives.

It is reprehensible for any person to select those laws he will obey and those he will ignore. Such defiance is a form of anarchy. It is shameful and disgraceful for persons in high authority to condone or urge the breaking of established laws.

I have also become increasingly concerned about the influence wielded upon the impressionable minds of our youth by some so-called educators—such as the college professor who reportedly urged a group of students at the University of California to burn their draft cards, refuse to pay income taxes and, if necessary, go to jail for their actions.

Civil disobedience is not, and must not become, an accepted norm of behavior in a society of freemen. It leads to anarchy—and preempts all possibility of rational discussion or appeal.

No longer can respectable citizens complacently stand by while celebrity status is accorded those sick minds and corrupt souls who tamper with and ridicule our orderly processes of Government under law.

We must choose between law and anarchy; freedom and chaos.

Is America as a Nation being swept by an epidemic of spiritual malnutrition? I fervently hope not; but the danger signs are all too clear. I fear that the public may be coming to accept widespread lawlessness as an unavoidable adjunct to our way of life.

What has happened to the civic pride, the righteous indignation, of otherwise respectable citizens who turn their backs on helpless victims of beatings, robberies and sex crimes? The incredibly indifferent attitude of these people is exacting a heavy toll. It has helped to turn the streets and parks of many cities into virtual jungles of fear—where, according to a recent survey, nearly one half of the residents are afraid to walk alone at night.

Despite the continuing efforts of some self-professed "experts" to minimize the crime problem, the undeniable fact remains that crime is increasing—in both numbers and intensity—at an alarming rate. It is growing six times as fast as our expanding population.

Last year, more than 2,600,000 serious offenses were reported to law enforcement agencies throughout the United States. This is the largest total on record. It means that more Americans felt the ravages of crime last year than ever before.

Today, the onslaught continues—with five serious offenses being recorded every minute. There is a vicious crime of violence—a murder, forcible rape or assault to kill—every 2½ minutes; a robbery, each 5 minutes; a burglary, every 28 seconds; and 52 automobiles are stolen every hour.

These figures are based on facts—unlike the illogical and inane criticism which has been voiced by that peculiar clique of sociologists and criminologists who are apparently suffering "armchair fatigue." These impractical theorists who attempt to "define away" our crime problem should step from their paper castles into the world of reality.

No one is more keenly aware of, or more deeply concerned with, the ravages of crime than the President of the United States. Last month, in signing the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—a bill designed to help strengthen the delicate machinery of justice in this country—he declared, "The control of crime is a major target of this administration."

The President has appointed a special Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice to look into and seek answers for the problems of crime control. He has the support of every responsible law enforcement official in this vital undertaking.

There is an urgent need today for realistic thought and realistic action in meeting the challenge of crime and immorality. This is especially true in the critical area of youthful criminality—where society has too long been asked to endure gross abuses of public and private trust by shallow-minded juvenile authorities.

The true meaning and intent of our great national holidays have been defiled by bands of defiant youths such as the arrogant young hoodlums who turned the Fourth of July this year into a nightmare of terror and destruction at resort communities in Ohio, Missouri, Iowa, and New York. Reports that participants in these orgies of lawlessness were being released after payment of small fines caused one great newspaper to observe, "About all that such slaps on the wrist will do is bring them out in force again next year. What they need, and what they ought to get, is 6 months at hard labor."

Whenever dangerous young hoodlums are encouraged to develop an attitude of "I can get away with anything—I'm a juvenile," society suffers and justice becomes a meaningless expression. Parental neglect, excessive weakness, categorical leniency, destroy respect for the law and for those charged with its enforcement.

In complaining last year of what it termed "Turnstile Justice," a major newspaper in New York demanded, "It's time that the public was told just why so many young criminals and terrorists are passed through this turnstile and sent back to the streets to kill, rape, rob, and assault the innocent."

Exaggerated charges? Not in the least. From 1960 through 1964, no less than 225 police officers were killed in line of duty. Nearly one third of the hoodlums arrested in connection with these murders were on parole or probation when the killings occurred.

The lives of six of these officers were claimed by criminals who had been paroled for a prior murder. Eleven lives were taken by offenders who had been paroled after confinement for felonious assault; and 32 of these officers were killed by paroled robbers.

We recently completed an examination of the records of nearly 93,000 criminals who were arrested in 1963 and 1964. This disclosed that 76 percent—more than three-quarters—had been arrested on at least one previous occasion. Over one-half of them had received lenient treatment, including parole, probation and suspended sentences, at some point in their criminal careers—and these criminals recorded an average of more than three additional arrests after their first encounter with the school of soft justice and official leniency.

Forty-one years ago, an experienced attorney and jurist in New York issued the strong warning: "It is not the criminals, actual or potential, that need a neuropathic hospital. It is the people who slobber over them in an effort to find excuses for their crime. The demand of the hour in America, above all other countries, is for jurors with conscience, judges with courage, and prisons which are neither country clubs nor health resorts."

The same demands of the hour continue to exist today. Tragically, the atmosphere of many courtrooms is still polluted by some jurors who deliberately close their minds to the evidence before them. Too many of our judges seek out technicalities rather than guilt or innocence. A trial should truly represent an enlightened search for truth so that deception, surprise, technicalities, and delay will be obliterated. The jousting in legal mumbo-jumbo resorted to by too many of our judges makes a farce of our judicial system.

But even if he should be convicted, the criminal knows that regardless of his past record there is steadily increasing hope for a suspended or a probationary sentence or an early release on parole.

The decent people in all sections of the country—East, West, North, and South—have suffered too long at the hands of terrorists set free with little more than a pretext of impartial consideration of their guilt.

They have tired of the street brawl tactics displayed by those lawyers-criminal who employ any means the courts will tolerate to defeat the interests of justice.

They are losing patience with systems of parole and probation that are little more than conveyor belts from our prisons and court chambers back to the underworld.

And they have become nauseated by the irresponsible actions of other sometime Americans such as those fair-weather patriots who eagerly grasp every right and privilege which our country guarantees its inhabitants—while ignoring the duties and obligations that citizenship necessarily entails.

Those who seek equal rights under the law should be taught to assume equal responsibility before the law. Certainly, civil rights and individual dignity have their vital place in life, but what about the common good and the law and order that preserve us all from lapsing back into the jungle?

We must have a world ruled by law. I am not one of those who believe in adding a great many more laws. The crux of the problem is that we do not observe the laws we already have; nor is the spirit of these laws interpreted by our courts to give equal justice to the criminal and to law-abiding citizens who are the victims of the savagery perpetrated on our streets and highways.

During my early years, a strong and lasting impression was made on my life by a schoolteacher who told our class one day that, in order to receive passing grades and qualify for graduation, each of us would have to master the "three R's" of reading, writing, and arithmetic. "But," she continued, "I hope you learn far more than that in my classroom because, in order to achieve true happiness and success in life, you will have to master an additional set of 'R's' the 'three R's' of Americanism—reason, respect, and responsibility."

Then she added, "You will also find that there is a fourth 'R' which is sacred to America. It is religion."

Today, there is a most urgent need for Americans to rededicate themselves to the strong moral principles upon which our Nation was founded.

As Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of man the country turns out."

Faith dominated the atmosphere at Independence Hall in Philadelphia where the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were framed.

Faith is our mainstay in the ideological struggle now raging between the camps of godless communism and human freedom.

And faith remains our strongest bulwark against the criminal and subversive enemies who would destroy our priceless heritage of liberty and justice for all. But faith without work will be of no avail—there must be unity of purpose.

America will continue to progress in dignity and freedom so long as our people cherish liberty and justice and truth and honor God.

Faith in God. That is the fortress of freemen.

Vain Visions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, in these days of discussion and debate on the problems of war and peace, it is a pleasure to insert the following sermon by Dr. Russell C. Stroup. Titled "Vain Visions," it was preached in the Georgetown Presbyterian Church in Washington, D.C., in November 1965.

Dr. Stroup's sermon follows:

VAIN VISIONS

(A sermon preached in the Georgetown Presbyterian Church by Dr. Russell C. Stroup, Nov. 7, 1965)

(Text: Ezekiel 13: 1–7.)

I wish I had the answers to all the problems of the world. I wish particularly that I had the answer to the primary problem of the world, which is the problem of peace. I agonize over the problem: I do not know the answers. When I was younger I thought I did. I thought I had all the answers, when, like so many young people in our own time I demonstrated for peace, when I remonstrated against war.

I have not lost my concern for peace. I have not lost my hatred of war. I am as I have always been a conscientious objector. When I had a draft card (which was not burned) it indicated that I was a conscientious objector. I held that card and that position, and when I volunteered to serve as a chaplain in the Army, and did so serve, this did not change my conviction.

But out of bitter experience, I have learned some things that I did not know then. I have learned something of charity and understanding and tolerance. When I was young I earnestly believed, as apparently many who demonstrate today believe, that all who disagreed with me were militarists, warmongers who did not love peace as I love peace. Those who did not understand us when we demonstrated said we were Communists, and we said they were militarists. Both were mistaken. There were then and there are now Communists. And there were then and there are now militarists. But the vast majority of our people are neither, whether they demonstate against war or not.

If all who love peace would take to the streets, our cities could not contain the march. In such a march the place of honor at the head of the column would go to the legions of the dead, who we remember this day and week. The dead of wars past, the dead who died yesterday. The young men—and they are always young—who paid the awful price of war with their own bodies. I have known these men. I have seen them die. With few exceptions, they were not fighters, although they fought well. They were not killers, although they had to kill. They were not sadists, although they suffered and caused suffering. They hated war. They longed for peace. Not the peace of the grave that they found, but a life of peace and a world of peace. In any march they would have the place of honor.

And next in the line of march would come, if they be spared, the men in Vietnam. They know, alas, what war is, as those who have not been there cannot know. War is hell. But what hell is, only those know who have known hell. I could not tell you who have not been there what war is. There are not words to describe the horror of it, its agony, its savagery. All that is worst in man is revealed in war. There is no way to make war "decent." There is no way to make war "pretty." War, for those who engage in it, is not a pleasant thing. Quite apart from the suffering and death, what can those who have not been there know of the emptiness of it, the boredom of it, the dirt and the wet, the heat and the hunger, the insects and the rats, the stench of rotting dead and the smell of fear itself? None can hate war as those who have known it. And none can love peace as those who have lost it.

So I think today of the men in Vietnam, men from this church, men from this land. I think of them with agony because I have been where they are. I know what this day and this night will be for them. And what of those who watch and wait at home? The mothers, the wives, the fathers, the brothers? For those who watch and wait for the word that may come, or for those to whom the word has come. And I may say that there is not a man fighting in Vietnam today so cruel, so savage as those with anonymous voices who, here in America, have called the widows of the dead in Vietnam to whisper, "I'm glad your husband is dead."

Let there be those who demonstrate against war. We need such demonstrations of varied opinion. But let us show humility, some understanding, some Christian charity. Let war be the villain, and not the President or the men who fight in Vietnam. Let there be criticism, but let us have done with that self-righteousness that seems to set "me" apart because I have these convictions. Let us have done with reckless condemnation. Let there be sanity and sympathy. We are all involved in the world's tragedy. No hands are clean, and we cannot wash them clean so long as we are part of the human family.

Let us understand and acknowledge the fact that while there may be honest differences in our minds as to the best way to procure peace, the hearts of all are united in the deep desire for peace. Let there be peace among us in our quest for peace.

Something more I have learned out of the experience of the years, my own experience as one who calls himself a pacifist. The pacifist must be a participator. The truly Christian conscientious objector, when the world is in agony, cannot stand apart from the world's pain. If I use my conscience to shield myself from suffering, I will lose my conscience and my humanity. In World War II I could not have retained a semblance of self-respect if, when millions were suffering and dying, I had sought safety for myself. I might refuse to fight, but I could not refuse to serve and to suffer. When crosses are raised, our cross must be there.

There are other fronts beside the battlefront where youth is needed. There are other battles being fought beside the battle with guns. There are wars against hunger and disease and illiteracy. If my conscience were sensitive to the suffering of the people of Vietnam due to war, the same conscience might well be troubled by the suffering of millions in other lands where there is no war. Indeed, in Vietnam itself one might serve and suffer to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for those who have borne the brunt of the battle, and for their widows and orphans. It has been said again and again that the war in Vietnam will not be won on the battlefields of Vietnam. The war, if it is won, will be won in the villages of Vietnam, where the people are, where they live in suffering, deprived of so much that is essential to life.

I read this past week that if the job were done that should be done in the villages of Vietnam for the people, in wartime and the time that may follow the war, it would require 45,000 teachers, engineers, agricultural experts, doctors, nurses, and others. A minimum of 45,000 to serve this present need. Would that we had some way in which those who would not serve, could not serve in battle, would serve here. Their service and sacrifice is desperately needed.

This, I think, is the Christian conscience that compels service. With our infantry outfit in World War II, there was a Medical Corps made of Seventh Day Adventists, all conscientious objectors, all refusing to bear arms where the Red Cross was no protection. They went unarmed into the battle, and they served and suffered and died. They had no protection; they refused any. They were firm in their faith, and they were glorious in their service.

At the National Institutes of Health, and in many hospitals in this country, there are young men who serve their tour of duty not in the armed services, but as living objects for experiment in the battle against disease. I have known these young men, and they give a glorious witness to their faith, to their convictions, through service and through sacrifice. Here, I think, is the witness that counts. And I think it is for us to offer this alternative increasingly to those who, for conscience sake, cannot bear arms, but who for conscience sake, should serve.

The conclusion I come to with great reluctance. I know the horror of war. I know that war will not and cannot settle the problems of Vietnam or any nation. However unavoidable war may be, I am deeply cerned with the ever-escalating armaments race. I wish with all my heart that this insanity were ended, that senseless slaughter would cease, that the wealth of treasure and talent wasted on weapons might be employed creatively in the service of mankind. That nations would resolve their differences around conference tables or in courts of law rather than on the battlefields. This I earnestly believe. But I also know, out of the experience of the years, that protesting is not enough, that personal pacifism is not enough. We must present a viable alternative to war. Peace must be positive. I have known for 40 years a pacifist quoted in the New York Times this morning as saying that if enough men burned their draft cards it would be impossible for this society to be at war, and "what a glorious day that would be." Now this sort of nonsense does no service to the cause of peace. *This easy solution is no solution* to the problem of war. It is a vain vision. We cry, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace." There must be a viable alternative to war before you may have peace. It is not enough to say "Peace." Something more is needed. And the alternative, as we have learned by experience, cannot be nonalinement, noninvolvement, or unilateral disarmament. These may well encourage war rather than prevent it. These are vain visions.

How short our memories are if we forget the painful lessons of the past. We have tried in this country neutrality and noninvolvement. *We have tried unilateral* disarmament. We were neutral when Japan invaded Manchuria and then China. We were neutral when Italy raped Ethiopia, when Hitler occupied the Ruhr, and then Austria and Czechoslovakia. We did not discourage the establishment of cruel dictatorships in Cuba and Santo Domingo, which were the prelude of the tragedies now apparent in these countries. We were not involved. We were nonalined. Prior to World War II we were not only neutral and noninvolved, but we were disarming in the face of the burgeoning military might of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Imperialist Japan and Communist Russia. We did not prevent war for these are not the alternatives to war. Something more is needed. We face a similar situation today, but we must find a better solution lest our world bleed to death through small wars, or commit suicide through one nuclear holocaust. But our opposition must be to all wars, not just to a war. We must find positive solutions, not simply negative actions.

Beyond that, as I have said, it is hopeless and senesless simply to oppose war unless we provide an alternative to war in settling the problems of mankind. And I can see no alternative to war save the establishment of international law, and an international organization capable of administering that law. There is a splendid vision in the Bible of the day of peace "when nations shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks." But the Bible does not simply suggest the beating of swords and spears into the instruments of peace. The Bible says in prelude to that, "The law shall go out from Jerusalem." To the ends of the earth, the law. "And they shall rebuke strong nations afar off." The power to enforce that law—not simply against the weak, but against the strong. When the law goes out, and the power is there to enforce the law, then we may in safety beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. Then "nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Neither shall they learn war any more."

Prayer: Our Father, we pray for pure hearts, with sympathy and understanding for all men. We pray for those who differ from us. And we pray that all of us may be guided in wisdom to find in the perplexing confusion of our time, the way that shall lead the nations of the world to the establishment of peace on earth and good will among men. We ask it in Christ's name, Amen.

Magazine Contradicted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks many newspapers and magazines have described the attorney general of Massachusetts as "the highest elected Negro" in America.

The following article, which appeared in the Flint, Mich., Journal on January *13, 1966, sets the record straight.*

MAGAZINE CONTRADICTED

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOHN C. MACKIE, Democrat, of Flint, has gone to bat for State Supreme Court Justice Otis M. Smith, of MACKIE's hometown.

MACKIE has taken issue with a statement in Newsweek magazine *to the effect* that Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W.

Brooke, announced candidate for the Republican Senate nomination in the Bay State, is the "occupant of the highest elective office now held by a Negro in the United States."

This, MACKIE says, simply isn't true.

As a member of Michigan's Supreme Court, elected to that office in November 1962, Otis Smith occupies the highest elective office of any Negro in the country, MACKIE points out.

Smith was named to Michigan's highest court after being elected auditor general of the Democratic ticket in 1960 and serving one term in that post.

Congressman Horton Praises WBBF Editorial Reaction to State of the Union Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, again it is my pleasure to share with my congressional colleagues, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the editorial expressions of radio station WBBF in Rochester, N.Y.

Robert S. Kieve, WBBF's general manager, has kindly made available to me the text of his station's two-editorial reaction to the state of the Union message. I believe these commentaries incisively and intelligently call attention to the recommendations by the President which will be crucial to the work of our second session.

Therefore, I take pride in offering these statements, and I also am including the text of my current weekly column as evidence of my parallel concern with the issues raised in the WBBF editorials:

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

JANUARY 13, 14, 1966.—How did you like the President's state of the Union address?

Here are some of WBBF's reactions:

We approved of Mr. Johnson's combination of tough and conciliatory words on the subject of Vietnam.

We were dismayed, though not surprised, to see that he is still urging passage of a bill to prohibit State right-to-work laws, but we're pleased that he wants the Congress to consider measures to help the Nation deal with strikes that threaten the national interest.

We were pleasantly jolted by the President's suggestion that Congressmen's terms of office should be 4 years instead of 2—and we were amused by the thunderous applause the suggestion drew—but we believe the proposal is new enough to call for a lot of careful thought before we take action on it.

We are highly favorable to the President's suggestion that the Congress should establish tax incentives to stimulate small contributions to political parties and candidates.

We applaud the President's interest in urging "legislation to strengthen the authority of Federal courts to try those who murder, attack, or intimidate civil rights workers * * * and to increase penalties to a level equal to the nature of the crime."

And on the subject of the President's budget? We'd like to discuss that in a later editorial.

"STRINGENT, COST-CONSCIOUS ECONOMIES"

JANUARY 14–15, 1966.—At one point in his state of the Union address, President Johnson told us: "While special Vietnam expenditures for the next fiscal year are estimated to increase by $5.8 billion, all the other expenditures in the entire Federal budget will rise by only $.6 billion."

We object to this way of describing the increase in the national budget. In the first place, "point six billion dollars" is really $600 million. It is $3 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is $3 in addition to each individual's share of that $5.8 billion in military expenses. And $5.8 billion, incidentally, comes to $29 per man, woman, and child.

And all of this—the $3 per person, plus the $29 per person—comes on top of the amount spent by the Government last year. It is an additional expense.

And if this way of expressing the expenditures oversimplifies, at least it is more accurate than the President's way of saying it. The President, after all, keeps talking about "stringent, cost-conscious economies" as if they resulted in cutting costs rather than in increasing them.

Since military expenditures are increasing significantly, we urge the President to keep nonmilitary expenditures right where they were last year. That's the least we can expect from "stringent, cost-conscious economies."

CONGRESS RECONVENES AND STATE OF THE UNION

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

One of the more eventful and event-filled weeks in Washington will be the subject of my report this week. Last week began with my returning to the Nation's Capital, after being home the week before to meet with the people I represent and tour the 36th Congressional District, and it ended with my departing from Capitol Hill for a round of weekend engagements in Rochester and our two counties of Monroe and Wayne. The days between held the reconvening of the 89th Congress for the 2d session, receiving the President's state of the Union message, the introduction of 16 new Horton bills, conferences with constituents, and answering much mail prompted by problems our country is facing.

Many of these problems were mentioned in President Johnson's address to the joint House-Senate session last Wednesday night. However, as you heard and read, the President went well beyond the war in Vietnam, devoting fully half of his speech to expansions and extensions of domestic programs.

The question then that confronts Congress—and I foresee a very lengthy session if we are to cover all this ground—is defining and refining. First, I think we have the obligation of establishing more precisely than did the President's remarks, where we are headed in southeast Asia. We need this in order to assess that which it is prudent and proper to provide on the homefront during a period of combat and conflict.

I certainly do not want to lose our forward movement in education, health and other areas of Federal encouragement and support for local and State programs. Therefore, I intend to direct much of my work at setting priorities for domestic needs, pushing ahead with the essentials and exercising restraint with those items the American people will be willing to curtail because of our defense costs in Vietnam.

By sharpening the appropriations pencil, I feel we can ward off, at least temporarily, the reimposition of telephone and new car excise taxes and the other stringent tax measures President Johnson is suggesting. I am especially opposed to excise taxes, which we fought so hard to remove last year, becasue they strike hardest at those least able to afford them, people with low incomes.

There are so many proposals the President offered that a full reaction would run as long as the Chief Executive's 55 minute speech did. Although, I do plan to refer to them in the weeks ahead through this report, the point about expanding trade with Communist countries has me very concerned. I already have brought this up to many of my colleagues and asked their support in seeking a detailed explanation of the proposal before we move any further.

The President said little that was new about our course in Vietnam. As I have indicated now for a number of weeks, this issue must be a central congressional concern and a full-scale debate is both desirable and demanded. The intensity of our involvement in Vietnam now must be matched by bringing this Communist confrontation into full view of the public.

If We Defer and Appease We Mortgage the Nation's Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Italian-American Veterans' Club of Chemung County in my congressional district. Simply but eloquently it sets forth the feeling of these veterans about the conflict in Vietnam and its meaning.

ITALIAN-AMERICAN VETERANS' CLUB,
CHEMUNG COUNTY CHAPTER,
Elmira, N.Y., January 10, 1966.

Representative HOWARD W. ROBISON,
Chemung-Tioga Counties, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.,

REPRESENTATIVE ROBISON: In the last several months, protests against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam has been sounded in scores of cities of this country. Most of the protesters are college students, although their numbers are comparatively few in relation to the schools they represent.

We do not know if the majority of these protesters are sincere in their beliefs that the United States should not be in Vietnam. What we do know and believe is that the majority of college students are behind their country wherever it may be committed to stop the growth of communism.

In the November 1965 issue of the Reader's Digest, a story appeared about one Capt. Christopher J. O'Sullivan. This man gave his life serving his country. His name could easily have been Jones, Schultz, Goldstein, or Mancini. The point is that instead of this story inspiring pride in our country and the men who serve us, to some people it inspired derision. This story about one brave American soldier should make us as Americans proud and yet humble.

We, as a veterans organization understand, perhaps a little better than most, what our servicemen are being subjected to in Vietnam, Korea, and all overseas posts. We feel that the fight against communism is no different than the war against fascism. The two, except for ideology, are the same: world domination.

The American people must face up to the facts that this is a war, perhaps not a total war, but nevertheless a war. The stakes in Vietnam are high; victory in Vietnam will prove that the program of Communist aggression can be defeated. We could defer and appease, but history has proved that if we do, we mortgage the Nation's tomorrow.

Fraternally yours,

ALBERT BACCILE,
Commander.

Ma Turney Gets Mail Through

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal in recent months about modernizing the Post Office Department to improve postal services. While studing new techniques and new tools, we must never forget that people, not machines, ultimately deliver the mail. In the midst of our criticisms of some aspects of postal service, we should pay deserved tribute to the many men and women who make their rounds faithfully and efficiently, day after day, in areas where this task is sometimes very difficult. One of these public servants is Mrs. Savilla Jane Turney, of Oakland, Md., who has been a star route contractor for the past 29 years. Ma Turney and her sons, Harry and Lloyd Turney, deliver the mail along a 60-mile rural route in rugged western Maryland. In recognition of their diligence and dedication to hard work, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a recent article from the Baltimore Sun about the Turneys and their route:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 30, 1965]

MA TURNEY GETS MAIL THROUGH

OAKLAND, MD., December 29.—It's been years since Ma Turney wore a pistol strapped to her ample waist, but the mail to and from this rugged western Maryland country still gets through, anyhow.

Getting it through is all in a day's work for Ma, formally listed in the records of the U.S. Post Office Department as Mrs. Savilla Jane Turney, star route contractor.

That's an independent carrier who hauls the mail, usually by truck and usually between towns not serviced by regularly scheduled trains or airplanes.

FAMILY AFFAIR

For 29 years, first with her husband until his death in 1948 and more recently with her two sons, Mrs. Turney has made the daily truck run linking points along a 60-mile route. It stretches from Terra Alta, W. Va., about 10 miles north of her Oakland home, to Cumberland, Md., 50 miles northeast.

"I like the work and the help I work with," said Mrs. Turney.

Half of the help is Harry Turney, 36. The other half is Lloyd Turney, 30.

To make their hauls, they use a pickup truck and a larger one.

"We've worn out about six others," said Ma.

About 50 years old, she still helps her husky offsprings load and unload their trucks. A blue denim apron protects her dark print dress, and a hairnet keeps her scarcely gray tresses in place. Her hands are big, gnarled, and calloused.

Mrs. Turney also handles the scheduling, does the paperwork, and accompanies whichever driver making the afternoon Oakland-Cumberland run.

They leave home at 5 p.m. and pull into Cumberland shortly before 7 p.m. After unloading their bulky canvas bags of cargo at the downtown post office, they catch a few hours of sleep in a nearby apartment, then return to load up again in time for a 6 a.m. departure for Westernport, Swanton and Oakland.

ONCE CARRIED GUN

The other son, driving the smaller truck, makes a later Oakland-Cumberland trip, arriving about 10 p.m. Four hours later he's off with a load of mail for Keyser, W. Va., Westernport and Oakland.

A reporter, thinking of the hazards in driving over snowswept mountains, recently asked Ma if she ever had any trouble. She misunderstood the question, and that's when she mentioned the pistol.

"Oh, I used to carry a .45-caliber gun," she said in the manner of a mail-hauler not to be trifled with, "but I don't anymore."

Back in Oakland after the Cumberland run, Ma sweeps up and scrubs down St. Mark's Lutheran Church. She's been the custodian there for 27 years.

One year she also baked huckleberry pies and passed them out to mail car crewmen on the end of her run. A woman has to do something with her spare time.

G. G. Dowling: South Carolina Business Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the Chamber of Commerce of South Carolina has just installed Mr. G. G. Dowling, of Beaufort, a distinguished low-country attorney and community leader, as its State president.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Dowling and to commend the chamber for such a wise choice. I cannot think of a more qualified person to head the organization. Well known throughout South Carolina and neighboring States, this dedicated public servant will bring energy, talent, and knowledge to the position. His enviable ability as a leader will do much to bolster the chamber's work. The News and Courier—one of my State's outstanding newspapers—paid an appropriate editorial tribute to the new president. Under leave to extend my remarks to the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include the editorial in my remarks.

BUSINESS LEADER

Installation Thursday at Columbia of a new president of the Chamber of Commerce of South Carolina brings a lowcountryman of distinction to the business leadership of our State. G. G. Dowling of Beaufort is a lawyer with a background of public service and a broad acquaintanceship with the people and the needs of South Carolina. He is a student of economics and politics who also has a practical knowledge of both fields. He has traveled abroad and has a feeling for the context of world events.

Mr. Dowling has a sense of obligation, supported by articulate skill, to impart his thoughts to others, both as an instructor in political science and economics at the University of South Carolina's branch in Beaufort and as a member of various committees and commissions. We congratulate the State chamber on obtaining such an able leader for 1966, and we thank Mr. Dowling for undertaking another assignment in public service.

Year 1964 Money Income of Male War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the latest statistics on the "1964 Money Income of Male War Veterans":

YEAR 1964 MONEY INCOME OF MALE WAR VETERANS, DECEMBER 30, 1965

The 1964 median personal income of war veterans was $6,300, according to a sample survey of the 20.9 million male war veterans in the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States.

Median income varied considerably according to age. It ranged from a high of $6,900 for veterans 35–44 years old (mostly World War II veterans) to a low of $2,100 for veterans 75 or more years old (predominately World War I veterans)—a difference of $4,800. Median income was $6,400 for war veterans 25–34 years old; $6,500 for those 45–54 years old; $5,300 for those 55–64 years old; $2,700 for those 65–69 years old; and $2,400 for those 70–74 years old. The median income of war veterans 75 years old and older, at $2,100, was only one-third as high as the median of all veterans.

The 15.5 million war veterans who worked at year-round, full-time jobs (at least 35 hours a week for 50–52 weeks, including paid vacations and sick leave) had the highest median income in 1964, at $7,000. This compares with a median of $4,300 for the 3.6 million veterans who worked part year (less than 50 weeks) or part time (less than 35 hours a week), and with a median of $2,100 for the 1.8 million veterans who did not work at any time during 1964.

The year-round, full-time workers had higher median incomes in every age class than veterans who worked part year and/or part time or who did not work in 1964. At age 35–44 years, where the peak median income of all veterans occurred ($6,900), the median income for year-round, full-time workers ($7,300) was over half again higher than the $4,700 median of part-year and/or part-time workers, and over 5 times the $1,400 median of nonworkers. Most of these 35–44 year-old veterans (82 percent) worked all year at full-time jobs, while 17 percent worked part year and/or part time, and only 1 percent did not work at any time during 1964. At age 65–69 years, however, half or 2 out of 4 did not work, 1 veteran in 4 worked part year and/or part time, and another worked full time. There was still a contrast in medians for this older age, but it was not so great. The veterans who were retired and did not work had a median of $2,200, appreciably lower than the median ($3,000) of the part-year and/or part-time workers, and substantially lower than the median ($5,200) of 65–69 year old veterans who still worked at year-round, full-time jobs.

About 9 percent of the 20.9 million war veterans did not work in 1964, and most were out of the labor force on account of illness, disabilities, or retirement. Median income for these veterans rose steadily from a low of $1,400 for veterans 35–44 years old to a high of $2,200 for veterans 65–69 and 70–74 years old—a range of $800—and then dropped to $1,900 for veterans 75 years old and older. Median income for the 1.4 million nonworking veterans 55 years old and older, at $2,100 was $500 higher than the $1,600 median of the 0.4 million nonworking veterans under 55 years old; nearly all older veterans received income from Social Security retirement payments, VA and private pensions, annuities, and other sources of income not available to most younger men.

Although most war veterans were comparatively well off, over 2 million had money income in 1964 of less than $2,000. About 600,000 received between $1,500 and $2,000, another 600,000 received between $1,000 and $1,500, and 800,000 had income less than $1,000. About 58 percent of these low-income veterans worked during the year, and of these, over 7 out of 10 were under 55 years of age, usually the prime earning years. Almost 23 percent (460,000) worked all year at full-time jobs, and about 8 out of 10 of these fully employed veterans (370,000) were under 55 years of age. About 35 percent worked only part year and/or part time, and of these, 7 out of 10 (500,000) were under 55 years old. Altogether, over 4 out of 10 of these veterans (870,000) with low personal incomes in 1964 were under 55 years of age. About 40 percent (830,000) of the low-income veterans had no earned income in 1964, and of these, only a relatively few (200,000) were younger than 55 years of age.

As a whole, war veterans improved their economic lot in nearly every age group in 1964, compared to their 1963 counterparts. Their median income, at $6,300, was up 3 percent from the 1963 level of $6,100. Nearly all of this increase occurred among year-round, full-time workers with a median of $7,000—up 4 percent from the median of $6,700 in 1963. These veterans benefitted most from the improved wages and business activity in our expanding economy.

The detailed data presented in the attached tables are from special tabulations of the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, made under contract for the Veterans' Administration.

TABLE 1.—*Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	20,868	3,163	8,922	5,325	1,320	2,138	1,063	822	253
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $500	2.0	1.9	1.4	2.1	3.8	2.8	2.8	2.4	4.1
$500 to $999	2.0	.6	1.5	1.8	3.7	4.6	3.0	5.3	9.2
$1,000 to $1,499	3.0	2.1	1.2	1.7	5.0	12.3	10.5	12.7	19.3
$1,500 to $1,999	2.8	1.0	1.6	1.5	3.8	13.0	13.2	13.2	11.5
$2,000 to $2,499	3.9	2.4	1.7	2.3	3.5	19.3	16.4	22.0	22.5
$2,500 to $2,999	2.8	1.8	1.8	2.0	3.6	9.5	8.7	10.6	9.6
$3,000 to $3,499	3.8	3.9	2.8	3.8	5.1	7.3	8.1	6.4	6.9
$3,500 to $3,999	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	4.3	4.1	3.8	4.6	3.2
$4,000 to $4,499	4.6	5.2	4.3	4.7	6.5	4.2	5.6	2.8	2.3
$4,500 to $4,999	4.4	4.4	4.3	5.0	5.8	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.8
$5,000 to $5,499	7.9	9.8	8.1	8.3	7.5	3.6	4.1	3.5	1.8
$5,000 to $5,999	4.9	6.6	4.8	5.9	3.2	1.3	2.2	.4	(1)
$6,000 to $6,999	13.3	16.1	14.8	14.7	8.4	3.1	4.4	2.2	.9
$7,000 to $7,999	11.7	14.4	14.0	12.0	7.1	1.5	1.3	2.2	(1)
$8,000 to $8,999	7.7	9.9	9.2	6.6	7.5	1.8	2.2	1.3	1.8
$9,000 to $9,999	5.3	6.0	6.4	5.3	3.5	1.4	1.2	1.8	.9
$10,000 to $14,999	11.3	8.1	13.2	13.0	10.4	4.5	5.6	4.0	1.4
$15,000 to $24,999	4.1	1.9	4.7	4.6	5.8	1.9	2.4	1.3	1.8
$25,000 and over	1.0	.4	.8	1.3	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.3	(1)
Median [2]	$6,330	$6,420	$6,880	$6,510	$5,330	$2,450	$2,740	$2,370	$2,130

[1] Rounds to zero.

[2] Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest $10.

NOTE.—The distributions are shown to the nearest "10th" of a percent for the use of technicians in combining income classes in their analyses of the data and not to indicate this degree of accuracy. The estimates derived by applying the percents should be rounded to the nearest 100,000.

TABLE 2.—*Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States who worked at year-round, full-time jobs, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	15,446	2,562	7,322	4,317	877	368	264	[1] 66	[1] 38
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	----------	----------
Under $500	.9	.9	.7	.9	1.8	2.4	2.4	----------	----------
$500 to $999	.5	.4	.5	.5	.6	1.4	1.8	----------	----------
$1,000 to $1,499	.8	.8	.5	.6	1.1	5.7	7.2	----------	----------
$1,500 to $1,999	.8	.4	.9	.6	1.0	3.0	3.0	----------	----------
$2,000 to $2,499	1.1	1.4	.9	1.0	1.1	6.0	6.0	----------	----------
$2,500 to $2,999	1.4	1.3	1.0	1.6	1.5	6.5	4.8	----------	----------
$3,000 to $3,499	2.8	3.7	2.1	2.8	4.2	5.7	1.8	----------	----------
$3,500 to $3,999	2.9	2.7	2.6	3.3	4.5	2.2	3.0	----------	----------
$4,000 to $4,499	4.3	4.8	3.8	4.0	6.8	8.7	10.2	----------	----------
$4,500 to $4,999	4.5	4.5	4.1	4.6	6.7	4.1	4.8	----------	----------
$5,000 to $5,499	8.6	9.7	8.3	8.8	8.8	7.3	9.0	----------	----------
$5,500 to $5,999	5.6	7.1	5.0	6.5	4.1	1.6	2.4	----------	----------
$6,000 to $6,999	15.5	16.3	15.7	16.2	12.0	9.0	10.7	----------	----------
$7,000 to $7,999	14.3	16.4	15.3	13.6	8.3	4.9	3.0	----------	----------
$8,000 to $8,999	9.2	11.1	10.0	7.1	8.8	6.5	6.0	----------	----------
$9,000 to $9,999	6.5	6.6	7.1	6.0	5.0	2.2	3.0	----------	----------
$10,000 to $14,999	14.1	9.1	15.3	15.2	13.9	12.5	11.9	----------	----------
$15,000 to $24,999	5.0	2.4	5.3	5.3	7.5	6.0	5.4	----------	----------
$25,000 and over	1.2	.4	.9	1.4	2.3	4.2	3.6	----------	----------
Median [2]	$7,020	$6,760	$7,260	$6,920	$6,660	$5,800	$5,230	----------	----------

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest $10.

TABLE 3.—*Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States, who worked at part-year, part-time jobs, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	3,648	544	1,492	837	286	489	280	184	[1] 25
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	--------
Under $500	3.8	4.3	3.4	4.0	8.7	1.0	(²)	2.4	--------
$500 to $999	4.8	1.5	5.1	5.9	6.8	3.9	2.8	4.9	--------
$1,000 to $1,499	5.8	8.0	3.5	6.1	10.7	6.7	7.3	5.7	--------
$1,500 to $1,999	5.2	2.8	4.4	3.8	6.3	11.5	11.9	10.6	--------
$2,000 to $2,499	7.1	6.8	5.5	7.0	5.3	13.5	11.3	18.7	--------
$2,500 to $2,999	6.4	3.7	5.8	4.0	6.3	15.3	15.8	13.8	--------
$3,000 to $3,499	7.0	4.6	6.7	8.7	5.8	8.8	13.0	3.2	--------
$3,500 to $3,999	6.2	6.7	7.1	4.5	3.9	7.8	4.5	11.4	--------
$4,000 to $4,499	6.7	8.0	6.2	7.3	6.8	6.1	9.1	2.4	--------
$4,500 to $4,999	5.5	4.6	5.4	7.0	6.8	2.9	4.0	1.6	--------
$5,000 to $5,499	7.4	10.4	7.7	7.5	5.8	4.3	2.8	5.7	--------
$5,500 to $5,999	4.0	4.9	4.2	4.0	2.0	3.5	5.1	1.6	--------
$6,000 to $6,999	9.5	15.3	11.2	9.4	2.4	3.1	1.7	4.1	--------
$7,000 to $7,999	6.4	5.8	8.3	6.1	6.8	1.2	1.1	1.6	--------
$8,000 to $8,999	5.2	4.9	5.9	5.2	7.8	1.3	1.1	3.3	--------
$9,000 to $9,999	2.7	3.7	3.2	2.5	1.0	1.8	1.1	3.3	--------
$10,000 to $14,999	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.5	5.1	4.1	--------
$15,000 to $24,999	2.0	(²)	2.4	1.9	2.9	2.3	2.3	1.6	--------
$25,000 and over	.3	(²)	.2	.9	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	--------
Median ³	$4,270	$4,960	$4,710	$4,410	$3,540	$2,940	$3,042	$2,740	--------

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest $10.

TABLE 4.—*Money income in 1964 of noninstitutional male war veterans in the United States who did not work, by age*

Money income in 1964	Total	Age in March 1965							
		25 to 34 years	35 to 44 years	45 to 54 years	55 to 64 years	65 years and over			
						Total	65 to 69 years	70 to 74 years	75 years and over
Number (thousands)	1,784	[1] 57	118	171	157	1,281	519	572	190
Percent, by income	100.0	--------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under $500	7.4	--------	16.7	22.0	5.9	3.8	4.9	2.1	5.6
$500 to $999	8.5	--------	18.0	16.1	15.1	5.8	3.6	5.8	11.7
$1,000 to $1,499	15.4	--------	18.0	8.5	14.3	16.3	13.6	16.3	23.5
$1,500 to $1,999	15.1	--------	7.7	13.6	14.3	16.4	19.1	15.0	12.0
$2,000 to $2,499	21.1	--------	2.6	13.6	12.6	25.1	24.6	24.5	29.0
$2,500 to $2,999	7.8	--------	6.4	4.2	10.9	8.3	6.7	10.5	5.6
$3,000 to $3,499	6.3	--------	(²)	4.2	7.6	7.2	8.5	7.4	3.1
$3,500 to $3,999	3.0	--------	2.6	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.7	2.9	1.8
$4,000 to $4,499	3.3	--------	11.5	6.8	4.2	2.0	1.5	2.6	1.8
$4,500 to $4,999	1.8	--------	(²)	3.4	(²)	2.1	1.5	2.4	2.5
$5,000 to $5,499	2.4	--------	2.6	(²)	3.4	2.3	2.1	2.9	1.2
$5,500 to $5,999	.5	--------	2.5	(²)	1.7	.2	.6	(²)	(²)
$6,000 to $6,999	1.8	--------	3.8	1.7	(²)	1.6	2.7	1.1	(²)
$7,000 to $7,999	.9	--------	2.5	1.7	1.7	.6	.6	.8	(²)
$8,000 to $8,999	.6	--------	2.6	(²)	(²)	.6	.9	.5	(²)
$9,000 to $9,999	.9	--------	(²)	(²)	(²)	1.2	.6	1.8	1.2
$10,000 to $14,999	1.9	--------	2.5	(²)	3.3	2.2	2.7	2.4	(²)
$15,000 to $24,999	.8	--------	(²)	1.7	2.5	.6	.9	.5	(²)
$25,000 and over	.5	--------	(²)	(²)	(²)	.7	1.2	.5	(²)
Median ³	$2,090	--------	$1,410	$1,630	$2,010	$2,160	$2,180	$2,220	$1,870

[1] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.

[2] Rounds to zero.

[3] Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest $10.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

Source of data

Information about the 1964 income of male civilian noninstitutional war veterans in the United States was derived from the Bureau of the Census' March 1965 Current Population Survey sample of approximately 25,000 households. The income distributions by age were applied to the independent VA estimates by age of the male civilian noninstitutional war veteran population in the United States to develop the income data presented in this report. Although income data are for the year 1964, the age refers to March 1965. (For details of the survey see "Consumer Income, Current Population Reports," series P-60, No. 47, Sept. 24, 1965, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C.)

War veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces during a war period (Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Korean conflict), have been separated from active duty and are now in the civilian noninstitutional population. The civilian noninstitutional population excludes all members of the Armed Forces, and inmates of penal institutions, chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, and the like.

Reliability of the estimates

Since the estimates are based on a sample, they may differ somewhat from the figures that would have been obtained if a complete census had been taken using the same schedules, instructions, and enumerators. As in any survey work, the results are subject to errors of response and of reporting, as well as being subject to sampling variability.

The standard error is primarily a measure of sampling variability; that is, of the variations that occur by chance because a sample rather than the whole of the population is surveyed. As calculated for this report, the standard error also partially measures the effects of response and enumeration errors but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. The chances are about 68 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample will differ from a complete census figure by less than one standard error. The chances are about 95 out of 100 that the difference would be less than twice the standard error. The following table shows the approximate standard error of an estimated percentage computed by using sample data for both the numerator and denominator of the percentage. The size of the standard error depends upon both the size of the percentage and the size of the class upon which the percentage is based.

Standard errors of estimated percentages (68 chances out of 100)

Estimated percentage	Base of percentage (thousands)								
	75	125	250	500	1,000	2,500	5,000	10,000	25,000
2 or 98	3.4	2.6	1.8	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.2
5 or 95	5.1	4.0	2.8	2.0	1.4	.8	.6	.4	.3
10 or 90	6.7	5.4	3.8	2.7	2.0	1.2	.8	.6	.4
15 or 85	8.3	6.4	4.6	3.2	2.3	1.4	1.0	.7	.4
20 or 80	9.3	7.2	5.1	3.6	2.5	1.6	1.1	.8	.5
25 or 75	10.0	7.8	5.5	3.9	2.8	1.8	1.3	.8	.6
35 or 65	11.1	8.6	6.1	4.3	3.1	2.0	1.4	.9	.6
50	11.8	9.0	6.4	4.5	3.2	2.0	1.4	1.0	.7

On Congressional Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article concerning the value of travel by the Members of the Congress.

The article was written by the Honorable Douglas MacArthur II, the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and one of the most able men serving our Nation.

The article appeared in the November 1965 Department of State Newsletter and follows:

MACARTHUR: ON CONGRESSIONAL TRAVEL

(By Douglas MacArthur II)

I have long believed, and my present assignment has confirmed me in that belief, that there are few areas in which the Department and the Foreign Service have greater opportunities for constructive accomplishment than in dealing with the Congress.

During the postwar era, it has become increasingly apparent: that our foreign policy cannot be successfully executed without full congressional support; that the congressional role in foreign policy is growing in scope and complexity; that this is a legitimate and necessary development in the conduct of a leadership foreign policy by a democracy; and that the demands which this growth makes on the Department are matched only by the demands it places on the Members of Congress themselves.

Our function, of course, is not—and indeed never was—to resist congressional participation in the policymaking process, but rather to welcome it and to help make it an efficient and mutually profitable one—for the Department and the Service, the Congress, and above all, for the American people whose interests we all serve.

There are countless ways in which this is being done here in Washington, such as: increased briefings of Members and committee staffs; greater contact by Members of Congress with the Diplomatic Corps and foreign visitors; assigning junior and middle grade FSO's to brief tours of duty in congressional offices; and the heightened and encouraging departmental effectiveness in the handling of congressional correspondence.

A major area of immediate opportunity for increased understanding is the field of congressional travel. The misguided tendency to regard congressional travel duties as an annoying chore is, happily, a disappearing one. Those of us who have had repeated opportunities to deal with traveling Members of Congress and their principal staff assistants have learned that congressional travel, if handled properly and with imagination, can be a great source of benefit to the Department as well as to the Congress.

Perhaps even more important for our FSO's in the field, it presents a unique opportunity to acquaint Members in detail with the problems we are facing abroad and thus engage their understanding and support. At the same time it gives those in the field a new insight into the concerns and worries of the American people and their elected Representatives in the field of foreign affairs.

It is difficult to imagine people who have heavier demands on their time and energies than Members of our Congress. They have their subcommittee work, their committee work, quorum calls, rollcalls, national problems, the problems of their constituencies, and a seemingly never-ending stream of visitors from their home district or State. Many of them simply do not have as much time as they would like when they are in Washington to devote to foreign affairs. When they travel abroad, on the other hand, they are free of many of these pressures and do have the time to focus on important foreign policy problems.

Contrary to the impression given in some irresponsible quarters, congressional travel abroad is neither frivolous nor insignificant, and I for one would recommend that every Member travel as much as his schedule will permit. It is a serious responsibility of their office enabling them to gather important material for further legislative work as well as deeper understanding of the great issues of war and peace in a troubled world. It is the occasion for them to observe at first hand how the Foreign Service functions and how, and why, our various programs overseas are working. My experience, and I am sure yours, has been that they are, almost without exception, eager to take advantage of this opportunity.

It is thus vitally important that our officers make the most of this chance to show the Service at its best as an effective and efficient instrument. We can give Members first-hand experiences that they can draw upon in responding to their constituents' questions or criticisms about the Service as well as about programs and policies.

The proper care and handling of congressional visitors is a task that demands the priority attention and best performance of everyone in the Service from the Chief of Mission right on down. Nothing less than this will do.

People and Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, it is not often a Member of Congress has the opportunity and pleasure to discuss a concrete action program instituted by interested citizens because they saw a need and decided to meet it. I have that distinct pleasure today, Mr. Speaker.

A group of interested citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., have for some time been concerned with the phenomenal increase in crime in the United States and have decided that citizen action is one of the few really long-term, effective methods available to counteract this national disease.

Mr. Speaker, Lincoln, Nebr., is not faced with the massive increase in crime that has plagued other areas of the country. But any crime is too much and Lincoln is a growing city and planning for the future has always been one of its trademarks.

The Lincoln Junior Chamber of Commerce, led by a member of my human resources committee, Mr. Ben Goble, has devised PAL which stands for people and law. An individual citizen may become a member for a small membership fee and participate in the activities of the organization—all of which are supported by the dues and other donations.

PAL will publish periodic bulletins on law enforcement, crime statistics, how the individual citizen may aid law enforcement officials, and training programs. In addition, PAL will sponsor a monthly award to a local law enforcement official who has distinguished himself as an officer and a citizen, sponsor a scholarship fund to be used by a student in the field of law, criminology or other related fields, and act as a resource group to promote the coordination and dissemination of information pertaining to law enforcement activities to schools, civic, service, and religious groups.

I commend the idea to those in other areas who face far greater problems in the area of rising crime rates.

Report on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, following the adjournment of Congress it was my privilege to make a study tour of southeast Asia, including Vietnam. This trip was not made as a part of any committee, but at my own expense so that I could report to the people of the Seventh District of Alabama, the situation in Vietnam as I saw it from firsthand inspection.

Upon my return I issued a report to my constituents on Vietnam and, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include that report. Of course, there have been later developments since my return from Vietnam, including the massive peace drive launched by the President over the Christmas period.

I believe we should do all possible to seek a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam and I find no fault in the efforts to do so. My concern is, that in our intense desire for peace that we may settle for less than victory. I would hate to think that Vietnam will become another Korea and that 12 years from now we will still have thousands of American boys still stationed in those jungles to maintain a peace that is not really a peace, but rather a stalemate. I would hate to think that we would get a peace in Vietnam by giving in to the Communists as we did in Laos and permit a Communist takeover under the guise of a coalition government.

We should be prepared to negotiate, but at the same time we should maintain our strength, our capacity for victory and make sure that the enemy knows we have that capacity and will use it if forced to do so by their failure to end their aggression.

My report on Vietnam, which was released in December, follows:

Special Report on Vietnam

(By Jim Martin, Member of Congress)

The cold war between the Communist conspiracy and the free world has become a hot and blazing war in Vietnam. Contrary to the statements of the pacifist and pro-Communist demonstrators, the war in South Vietnam is not a civil war against a tyrannical government. It is naked aggression of South Vietnam by Communist North Vietnam, encouraged and supported by Red China and Soviet Russia. I have just traveled more than 20,000 miles through all of Asia and into the Middle East for a firsthand investigation. This report is based on conditions as I found them in my tours of the villages of Korea, Taiwan, South Vietnam, Thailand, and India; through briefings by our civilian and military leaders and through lengthy conversations with the businessmen, industrialists, political leaders, and the people of all the countries I visited.

Any study of the war in Vietnam must begin with the stated creed of the Communist leaders of Red China. Mao Tse-tung, head of the Communist Party in China, has stated:

"Every Communist must grasp the truths. Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun. Whoever has an army has power, for war settles everything. The theory of war and strategy is the core of everything."

Every action of Red China has been based on that creed. They have attempted to stir up discontent and revolution in both Africa and Asia and where subversion did not work, they resorted to upright aggression as in Korea and now in Vietnam. This is the enemy we face, and the Communist goal of world domination has never changed. Even now the only differences between Red China and Soviet Russia is on how to accomplish the goal. The Russian leaders believe the world can be subverted through subtle means while the Chinese leaders believe in the hard core Communist line of Lenin and Stalin, that the world must be conquered through war.

My first impression in my travel through Asia was the lesson of Korea. We may be making the same mistake in Vietnam. Twelve years after the armistice in Korea, the United States still has 50,000 American soldiers there facing the Communist enemy eyeball to eyeball across the 38th parallel. Our military was prevented from winning the war in Korea because of political decisions which gave enemy forces a safe sanctuary in Chinese territory across the Yalu River and because they were prevented from bombing the supply lines leading into North Korea from Red China.

Today, in Vietnam our military forces are facing many of the same restrictions. We cannot win the war in Vietnam by sending American boys into the gristmill formed by the countless thousands of North Vietnamese and Red Chinese which can be thrown against them from safe sanctuaries in Red China, Cambodia, and Laos. It is clear to me, and I am convinced my views are shared by our generals and commanding officers in Vietnam, that we should win the war and then negotiate the political problems.

We can win the war if we give the military the authority to win it. First. We should blockade the harbor at Hai Phong, mining it if necessary and warning all nations that no more material of war will be permitted. Second. We should authorize the Air Force to bomb strategic military targets such as the two railroads and mountain passes in North Vietnam which are direct routes for shipping war supplies into North Vietnam from China. We should also bomb military airfields, actual missile sites wherever they are located even within the safe sanctuary around Hanoi. Bombing targets should also include munitions factories as well as gasoline and fuel storage tanks, all of which are now out of bounds for our Air Force within certain restricted areas. Third. We should make clear to any enemy troops threatening the South Vietnamese that there will be no sanctuary from which they may safely invade. The United States has the potential forces to smash the Communist enemy in Vietnam, and we should assure our commanding general there that he will be given whatever forces and supplies necessary to win. The military is ready—the American people are in support of a policy to win—it is up to the administration to give the word.

CLEAR POLICY BACKED BY DEEDS IS NEEDED

While the hot war is in Vietnam, we cannot isolate one single country in Asia. The target of Red China is all of Asia, then Africa, and finally, the world. Like it or not, the United States is looked to for leadership by those nations and those people who still hope to remain free. From my conversations with people in all walks of life in the countries I visited, I find that the people of Asia are concerned about our intentions and our willingness to back our words with deeds. They are not sure we will stick with them when the chips are down. They are afraid of another stalemate such as Korea. They are afraid we may withdraw our troops before the victory is won. The statement by the Secretary of Defense prior to the last election that "we will bring the boys home from Vietnam by Christmas," caused a shattering blow to the morale of the South Vietnamese. Feeling that we were getting ready to pull out, many of the village chiefs and others in South Vietnam prepared to make peace with the Vietcong. Sharing the belief that we would not stay, the Vietcong were able to consolidate their hold on nearly 80 percent of the land and the people of South Vietnam. In addition, American mothers were given the false hope that their boys would not have to fight. We are paying in blood for this mistake in judgment.

We must make it clear that the United States stands with all those who want to be free and are determined to fight for their freedom. Then we must show by deed, that is by force of arms and determination, that we are prepared to win the war in Vietnam and meet head on any future Communist aggression.

TRIP NO EXPENSE TO GOVERNMENT

In the months ahead I will report to you in greater detail on my tour of inspection. I would like to make two things clear. This trip was made at my expense. My administrative assistant accompanied me and he, too, paid his own way—as did Mr. Wallace Malone of Dothan. The trip was made with the encouragement of the Department of State and the commanding officers in the field because they feel it is most important that Members of Congress see at first hand actual conditions in Vietnam, the need for all-out effort, and the manner in which our troops are meeting the challenge.

Job Corps Has Backer in Flint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. MACKIE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity's Job Corps program is starting to pay dividends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following excellent story on one Job Corps graduate that appeared recently in the Flint, Mich., Journal.

The tax dollars used to train Leonard Hamilton will, I am sure, be repaid a hundredfold in the years ahead. The money being spent on the war on poverty is one of the best investments America can make in its future:

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, Dec. 26, 1965]

Job Corp Has Backer in Flint

(By Herschel P. Fink)

Six months ago Leonard Hamilton had trouble finding a job.

He was 20 years old and had dropped out of school after the 10th grade. For a while he worked as a janitor. Then he found work clearing construction sites of weeds and pop bottles. Sometimes he couldn't find work.

Today, Hamilton sits at a draftsman's table in a brightly lighted office at Consumers Power Co. He has a trade that he hopes will mean the start of a new life for him.

The Job Corps, part of President Johnson's war on poverty, gave Hamilton the chance to do something for himself. He is the first graduate of a Job Corps camp to return to the Flint area.

Since last May, about 30 area men, aged 16 to 21, have gone to Job Corps camps around the country for training. Many of them, like Hamilton, were high school dropouts who found that thier lack of job skills made them virtually unemployable or suited only for menial labor.

Hamilton looked at the Job Corps as "my last hope." He heard about it while watching television last April and applied at the Michigan Employment Security Commission's Flint office, 706 North Street.

In June, he was assigned to the Gary Job Corps Center in San Marcos, Tex.

At the camp, Hamilton was allowed to choose from a variety of skills being taught. He picked a drafting course. Besides job training, corpsmen take remedial arithmetic and English classes.

Pay in the Job Corps is $80 a month. The Government places $50 of that in a bank account for the corpsman which can be collected when he leaves the center.

Although corpsmen are given 2 years to complete their training, Hamilton wasted no time. He completed the course last month.

Thomas J. Tomaskovich, employment service supervisor for the Flint MESC office, said that Hamilton completed the drafting course "with honors."

Hamilton's Job Corps report rated him "excellent in connection with his potential in the drafting field."

Tomaskovich, also reported that Hamilton's progress at the camp was so rapid he was offered a job as an assistant instructor.

"But I was in a hurry to get back and get to work," Hamilton recalls.

On the strength of his Job Corps record, Hamilton was offered a job by Consumers as an engineering clerk. His department lays out power and gas distribution lines. In the job he will use his drafting skills to make layouts.

"The job usually requires a high school diploma and drafting experience," said Ward W. Bloxson, personnel and safety supervisor at Consumers. "We felt, however, that based on his outstanding record in the Job Corps—one of the highest there—he qualified for a chance."

Hamilton considers joining the Job Corps "one of the best things a boy can do if he wants to learn."

Life at the Job Corps camp wasn't easy, he said, "but if you want to do something bad enough, you learn to take the bad with the good."

He emphasizes that a youth "has to want to learn, to profit from the Job Corps."

He is happy about his decision to join.

"When things get hard, you can't get unskilled work. But when you've got a trade, you don't have much to worry about."

Hamilton doesn't plan to end his education with his Job Corps graduation. He hopes to take advantage of a Consumers' program which will pay 75 percent of college tuition costs. He wants to take classes at Flint Junior College. Eventually, he would like to earn a college degree.

Gen. James M. Gavin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great soldier-statesmen is Gen. James M. Gavin. A beribboned World War II paratroop commander, General Gavin was a strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops. This sky cavalry concept is now being used effectively by the United States in Vietnam.

After distinguished service as our Ambassador to France, General Gavin returned to the United States. He is now president of that eminent research firm, Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass.

In a letter appearing in the February 1966 issue of Harper's magazine, the general warns that a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam could prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well. He also emphasized:

> To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the South.

I concur with the general's view of this matter. Indeed, it was this conviction that motivated me to join recently with 16 of my House colleagues in writing the President to express our vigorous opposition to those, including Richard Nixon and Barry Goldwater, who have urged the United States to extend its bombings to the Hanoi area.

General Gavin also makes the following vital point. He said that the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

This proposal is similar to one made some months ago and repeated since then by the distinguished Columnist Walter Lippmann.

And the Washington Post, in an editorial Sunday, January 16, took a similar approach:

> It is our purpose—

The Post declared—

> to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of national liberation, and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include here an Associated Press report on General Gavin's letter which appeared in the Washington Post of January 17, and the Post's editorial of January 16:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 17, 1966]

Gavin Says Hanoi Bombing Could Bring in Peiping Units

New York, January 16.—Gen. James M. Gavin declared today a massive buildup of U.S. forces in Vietnam may prompt Red China to send troops there and reopen the Korean war as well.

The 58-year-old former chief of U.S. Army research and development suggested that America concentrate instead on holding major bases along the South Vietnam coast while diplomats seek an end to the fighting.

In a letter appearing in the February issue of Harper's magazine, Gavin said:

"To increase the bombing and to bomb Hanoi—or even Peiping—will add to our problems rather than detract from them, and it will not stop the penetrations of North Vietnam troops into the south.

"Also, if we were to quadruple, for example, our combat forces there, we should then anticipate the intervention of Chinese 'volunteers' and the reopening of the Korean front.

ESCALATION SEEN LIKELY

"This seems to be the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

Gavin said the 190,000 U.S. troops already in the Vietnam theater would suffice "if we should maintain enclaves on the coast, desist in our bombing attacks on North Vietnam, and seek to find a solution through the United Nations or a conference in Geneva."

He asserted that an attempt to make all of South Vietnam secure from the Communists "would take many times as much force as we now have in Vietnam"—and risk a fresh outbreak of Red Chinese aggression in the Korean pattern.

"I do not for a moment think that if we should withdraw from Vietnam the next stop would be Waikiki," Gavin said. "The Kra Peninsula, Thailand, and the Philippines can all be secured, although we ultimately might have heavy fighting on the northern frontiers of Thailand."

Emphasizing that he spoke "solely from a military-technical point of view," Gavin recalled that he was Chief of U.S. Army plans and operations at the time of the French military disaster in Dienbienphu.

He said Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then Chief of Staff, "directed that we go into the situation quite thoroughly in case a decision should be made to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta."

"The more we studied the situation," Gavin wrote, "the more we realized that we were, in fact, considering going to war with China, since she was supplying all the arms, ammunition, medical, and other supplies to Ho Chi Minh.

"If we would be, in fact, fighting China, then we were fighting her in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage."

Gavin said southeast Asia is no place to take on Red China in military combat.

"Manchuria, with its vast industrial complex, coal, and iron ore, is the Ruhr of China and the heart of its war-making capacity," he said. "There, rather than in southeast Asia, is where China should be engaged, if at all."

SHOWDOWN NOT YET DUE

Gavin added that if Red China continues aggression and arms itself with nuclear weapons "the time may come when China will bring upon herself a nuclear war. But that time is not here yet."

Gavin, a paratroop commander in World War II, retired from the Army in 1958 because of differences with the Eisenhower administration over modernizing the Armed Forces. He was a particularly strong exponent of more aerial mobility for ground troops.

Gavin called this "the sky cavalry concept, which we are now employing in South Vietnam" and commented:

"When I retired in 1958, I said that I would be happy to serve as a private in the Army if it were the kind of an Army that I wanted it to be.

"I think it is that kind of an Army now. * * *"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 16, 1966]

After the Pause

The President very wisely has put no terminal date on his peace offensive or on the pause in air operations against the North while the peace efforts go forward. Since there has been no known response from Hanoi, either affirmative or negative, it is too early to say whether there will be any results. Sooner or later, if there are no negotiations at all, consideration will have to be given to the next military moves.

There is a powerful impulse in the Congress, in the country, and in some places in the executive department, for a resumption of air activity and for an initiation of full-scale warfare against the North to put a speedy end to a disagreeable war. Powerful as this impulse is, and strong as the support may be for the use of more military muscle, it is to be hoped that the President will reject the counsels of those who wish to escalate the war. There is not much reason to believe that an unlimited air war would achieve decisive results. North Vietnam does not present the kind of industrial targets that are peculiarly vulnerable to mass bombing. Even if the United States were indifferent to the moral arguments against mass bombing (and it is not indifferent), the practical results probably would not be any more decisive than were the results of area bombing in World War II. While stepped-up interdiction of communications might further diminish the ability of North Vietnam to give logistic support to a conventional military invasion, there is not much hope that it would stop infiltration of troops in small units. And, even if the bombing succeeded in all these counts, the Chinese Communist support of North Vietnam might make the results indecisive. As long as air operations are directed at North Vietnam (and not China), we are embarked upon the task of kicking the cart until the horse cries for mercy.

The unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces is a course for which there is little responsible support in the country. And the primary reason is that no one can give any assurance that this policy would be any more successful as a means of ending the war in southeast Asia than the policy of escalating the conflict. Escalation might simply move the war to another and larger theater. Withdrawal also would be likely to move the conflict to another theater in another country.

To continue or expand the present offensive against the Vietcong in the south, by the employment of the tactics now being pursued, is going to involve a heavier commitment than we have so far made if it is to have any reasonable prospect for success. Such an expanding commitment, accompanied by rising commitments of North Vietnam and China and Russia, might easily produce another stalemate at a higher level.

The facts of the situation seem to argue strongly for a somewhat different application of the military power we feel we can appropriately commit to the area. No doubt it is an alternative that already has been explored—and perhaps even rejected. But it can be argued quite persuasively that in the next phase of the war, the United States and its allies might wisely alter the character of the war in the direction of a more economical and efficient deployment. At present, we are engaged in an offensive-defense, employing both ground and air forces in the hot pursuit of Vietcong elements into terrain offering the greatest advantages of concealment and the most serious hazards to pursuing forces. To seek out and destroy a guerilla force by such tactics, overwhelming force is required on a ratio of at least 10 to 1. The present ratio, counting all South Vietnam and American and allied forces is 826,000 to 230,000 according to the Mansfield report—and the rate of North Vietnam infiltration is on the order of 1,500 a month. So the possibility or feasibility of achieving antiguerrilla ratios like those in Malaysia and the Philippines is remote.

If it is difficult or impossible for us to annihilate the Vietcong without a military investment that looks excessive, it can be made impossible for the Vietcong to achieve their objectives without a deployment beyond their means. Were our tactics to alter from pursuit to a take-and-hold basis, the burden for the offensive could be shifted to the Vietcong. It is our purpose to deny North Vietnam the fruits of a war of "national liberation," and we can do that by successfully holding the areas now occupied and slowly and persistently enlarging them by territorial sweeps instead of jungle pursuit. The American and South Vietnam forces, while steadily expanding the occupied areas and pushing out their defense perimeters, would be chiefly engaged in garrison operations. These, of course, are wasteful in terms of manpower employed but economical in terms of manpower expended. They are less hazardous and more feasible for a country in command of air power and thus able to maintain communications with scattered garrisons than they were for the French. Within the areas occupied by the South Vietnamese and by our forces, a program of rehabilitation and reconstruction could be pushed forward, once it becomes possible to afford the peasants and villagers security.

The military priorities under such a strategy, would be (1) securing of areas already held, (2) expansion of that territory only as rapidly as we are prepared to take and hold new real estate, (3) pursuit operations only where they can be carried out with greatest economy of force, (4) air operations chiefly in close suport of territorial enlargement, and, as indicated, against large and vulnerable enemy concentrations, (5) air interdiction of routes from the North, scaled to the degree of infiltration, (6) no air attack on North Vietnam for the time being or unless surveillance discloses massing for offensive operations against the South.

This is no quick and easy formula for an offensive military success in conventional military terms. It contemplates neither the annihilation of enemy forces, the crushing of the enemy's will to resist or the solid gains of invasion and quick occupation. It projects the steady, slow, and patient pacification and reconstruction of South Vietnam. It must be acknowledged that success will consist of denying the victory of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in all the territory we are prepared to take and hold and then rebuilding that occupied area and providing the inhabitants with a higher standard of living. The forces required will be quite large; but the losses in combat should be much smaller with the defending forces enjoying the advantages of well-equipped men in strong defensive positions. It will cost more money; but it should cost fewer lives. It will take more time—but we should not be in a hurry.

Away from the combat areas, the strategy has the virtue of making it clear to the world that our role is purely defensive. The war in South Vietnam will come to a stop if the forces of the National Liberation Front quit their attacks. Every dispatch from the war areas will make it plain that it is the Communists who are responsible for loss of life and destruction of property. In the absence of negotiated peace there can be, under this formula, a tacit peace, whenever the Vietcong wish it.

This is no blueprint for either victory or peace in a hurry. But it is a blueprint that involves the surrender of no principle; it makes possible the deescalation of the conflict; it contemplates the confinement of the war to the area now involved. It does not have the simplicity of victory or surrender. It plainly looks forward to an admittedly remote date when enough of the territory of South Vietnam will be secure so that there can be normal elections under which the people can pick a government of their own choice—and decide for themselves whether they wish to affiliate with North Vietnam or retain their independence.

Tribute to Hon. Herbert C. Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying homage to the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. It was my privilege to serve but briefly with this courtly gentleman on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which he so ably chaired for more than a decade.

My great regret is the brevity of my association with HERB BONNER. It is my personal loss that I did not know him sooner. He was a man whom I rapidly grew to respect and admire. Dedicated in purpose and undaunted by adversity, Chairman BONNER gave unsparingly of himself to the service of his constituents, the development of a strong American merchant marine, and the preservation of this Nation's natural resources. The product of his tireless efforts stand in tribute and memorial to his skill and dedication.

The late Father Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., of Georgetown University, was a stanch advocate for a strong American merchant marine. Men such as Congressman BONNER must have been in his thoughts when Father Walsh wrote:

> A statesman is the rare thinker who keeps his gaze fixed on the next generation. He will have learned wisdom from past errors and schooled himself to distinguish the deep and permanent residue of economic history from the surface tones that speak only of quick gains and enhanced profits. He will be a statesman in the measure that he teaches men to fasten on abiding values and rescues them from the lure of the temporary and the transient.

Such a public leader was the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. His untimely death is a loss not only for his beloved State of North Carolina, but for the Nation as a whole.

To the widow of our late beloved chairman and to other members of his family, I extend my heartfelt sympathy in this their hour of bereavement. All our hearts are saddened over their loss, but comforted in the knowledge of the privilege of having known and labored with the late Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER. I knew him as a wonderfully generous, considerate, always fair, and effective chairman under whose leadership I was proud to serve.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*	
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*	
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.*	3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*	
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak*	
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*	
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Baldwin, John F., *Calif*	
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*	
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Battin, James F., *Mont*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	3421 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Clarence J., Jr., *Ohio.*	
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif*	
Broyhill, James T., *N.C*	
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buchanan, John, *Ala*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*	
Burton, Phillip, *Calif*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex*	
Cahill, William T., *N.J*	
Callan, Clair, *Nebr*	1200 S. Courthouse Rd., Arlington, Va.
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga*	
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*	
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y*	
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*	
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif*	
Clawson, Del, *Calif*	
Cleveland, James C., *N.H*	
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Corman, James C., *Calif*	
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*	
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J*	
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*	
Davis, John W., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex*	
Delaney, James J., *N.Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Dickinson, William L., *Ala*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dole, Robert, *Kans*	6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C*	2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y*	1705 Longworth House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn*	
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg*	914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*	
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Edwards, Don, *Calif*	9201 Fox Meadow La., Potomac, Md.
Edwards, Edwin W., *La*	
Edwards, Jack, *Ala*	
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans*	
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill*	
Evans, Frank E., *Colo*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y*	
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky*	
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Findley, Paul, *Ill*	
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., Pa	The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R.I*	1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash*	
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich*	
Fountain, L. H., *N.C*	The Wertchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn*	
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn*	
Fuqua, Don, *Fla*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla*	
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y*	
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*	
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex*	200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y*	3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*	
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., *Pa*	
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*	301 G St. SW.
Grider, George W., *Tenn*	119 7th St. SE.
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla*	
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, Durward G., *Mo*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y*	
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind*	
Hanley, James M., *N.Y*	
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif*	
Hansen, George, *Idaho*	
Hansen, John R., *Iowa*	800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*	
Harvey, James, *Mich*	
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*	
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*	
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	3424 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria. Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J*	
Henderson, David N., *N.C*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash*	
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Howard, James J., *N.J*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Hungate, William L., *Mo*	
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H*	
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich*	
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J*	
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Karsten, Frank M., Mo	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kee, James, *W. Va*	5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	4517 Wetherill Dr., Westmoreland Hills, Md.
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y*	The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y*	
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C*	
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J*	
Kunkel, John C., *Pa*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	
Langen, Odin, *Minn*	
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*	
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif*	
Lennon, Alton, *N.C*	

Appendix

Wage, Cost Increases Likely To Be Central 1966 Economic Issue

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert excerpts from an address given by Dr. Leslie C. Peacock, vice president and economist of the Crocker-Citizens National Bank of San Francisco, entitled "Wage, Cost Increases Likely To Be Central 1966 Economic Issue." Dr. Peacock gave this address before the Commonwealth Club of California on Friday, January 7. Excerpts follow:

WAGE, COST INCREASES LIKELY TO BE CENTRAL 1966 ECONOMIC ISSUE

(By Dr. Leslie C. Peacock)

The national economy is about to enter its sixth year of uninterrupted business expansion, and virtually all signs point to a continuation of strong economic gains in 1966. In the private sector, expansive forces which have contributed so strongly to rising levels of business activity are still at work. The sharp uptrend in business spending for new plant and equipment is as yet showing no signs of a significant lessening.

INCREASING STRAIN AHEAD

In the public sector, moreover, the outlook is for an even faster rate of increase in the level of government spending.

Combined, the prospects for a convergence of heavier public demands and still-rising private demands for goods and services suggest that the economy's productive facilities will come under increasing strain in 1966. The prospects for intensification of these strains are implicit in most of the forecasts for 1966 gross national product which now are being advanced.

PRODUCING AT CAPACITY

As time has passed, the Nation's economy has drawn progressively nearer the physical limits of its capacity to expand output, and for all practical purposes, we now have achieved virtually full utilization of our productive resources.

This is reflected not only in the low level to which unemployment rates have fallen, but also in the fact that most industries are either at or near their optimum operating rates. From this point on, further increases in output will have to come more slowly—as the labor force grows, as new capital equipment is brought into operation, and as the productivity of labor improves.

MUST RESTRAIN GROWTH

The Federal Government must turn increasingly toward the objective of restraining growth in private demand in order to preserve the cost and price stability which has been generally maintained over the past 7 years. Even at best, the prospects for preserving this stability of cost and prices are not bright, and the stage already appears set for general price and wage breakthroughs in 1966.

The extent to which growth in private demand must be restrained by Federal policies in 1966 will depend heavily, of course, on the fiscal policy decisions which underlie the Federal budget. Preliminary indications are that the amount budgeted for national defense may rise to something around $60 billion in fiscal 1967. The progression to the higher level will be unusually fast.

INFLATION THE CENTRAL FISCAL PROBLEM

It is clear that normal revenue growth cannot finance all of the increased outlays in the defense area. This raises the question whether or not cutbacks in civilian spending programs can be budgeted in order to prevent fiscal stimulus from becoming excessive. It appears unlikely that budget reductions can be scheduled.

In view of the inflationary impetus which is inherent in an enlarged Federal deficit, the problem of restraining wage and cost increases is likely to become the central problem of national economic policy in 1966.

The emergence of stronger inflationary pressures as a threat to economic stability suggests that increasing reliance on monetary policy will be required to restrain growth in private demands for goods and services. Such reliance ordinarily is associated with a rising level of interest rates and, although rates now are at levels which are relatively high, further upward adjustments may well lie ahead.

PRIVATE CREDIT DEMANDS STRONG

Private credit demands are extremely strong at the present, and they are not likely to lose any of their momentum in 1966. In some cases, including the demand for mortgage funds and the needs of business for credit, some increases are likely to occur. In the case of Government demands for credit, further increases will be forthcoming at both the Federal and the local levels.

For a number of reasons, it appears likely that interest rate pressures in 1966 will be felt most keenly in the short end of the market. In addition, thrift institutions (including banks) must compete aggressively with short-term money market instruments in order to retain their existing volume of savings funds at their disposal.

Looking ahead to the strength of demands expected to be made on the economy's resources in 1966, it is not certain that monetary policy alone can restrain cost and price increases without giving rise to a credit squeeze of undesirable consequences. In the short run, a tax increase probably would be more effective than a reduction in nondefense spending as a means of curbing growth in private demands for goods and services.

TAX INCREASE?

Naturally, a tax increase at this time would be an unwelcome development for both businesses and consumers. However, it may well be the lesser of the evils. The precise economic impact of a tax increase would depend on both its size and its structure, but under any circumstances it could be expected to exercise a dampening influence on rates of growth in consumer spending, corporate profits, and—with some lag—business investment.

WORST GOLD PROBLEM BEHIND US?

At the moment, it is clear that the predominant influence in equity markets are the sharp rate of growth in corporate earnings, strong business prospects, and investor awareness of intensifying inflationary pressures. These considerations provide legitimate and time-honored bases for higher stock values. However, it may be well to continue to test at least two key assumptions.

First is the assumption that the corner has been turned by the United States and the United Kingdom in seeking permanent answers to the international financial problems which periodically have plagued us in the past. Neither the United States nor the United Kingdom has made sufficient progress toward the restoration of balance-of-payments equilibrium to warrant the assumption that the worst is behind us. The heightening of inflationary pressures in this country does not augur well for the future behavior of our gold and balance-of-payments position.

The second assumption is that our instruments of economic control have become so finely tuned as to allow us to avoid a temporary economic setback from time to time. No such setback appears in prospect for 1966, yet it is true that the kind of public and financial policies which now are required to limit inflationary pressures are not appreciably different from those which, in the past have served to take some of the steam out of economic expansion and set the stage for at least a moderate downturn.

The year 1966 will feature strong business activity, heavy credit demands, a stronger inflationary impetus, upward pressures on interest rates, more restrictive Federal financial policies (including possibilities of a tax increase), and little or no progress in the campaign to restore equilibrium to our balance of payments.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. Hilary H. Crawford: Is Secretary of Treasury correct in saying national debt can be reduced? Answer. Difficult to defend position that we could—rather likely to increase, ad infinitum.

Question. Should controls over savings interest rates be removed? Answer. Not in favor of complete removal of Government controls over commercial bank interest rates.

Question (Edgar M. Kahn). How discuss outlook without knowledge of outcome in Vietnam? Answer. Basic assumption is continued buildup; it's an imponderable. Any relief would permit greater expansion by private sector.

Question (R. Cathcart). Comment on Martin's statements regarding a likeness to 1929. Answer. Very constructive. Designed to dispel euphoria in some circles. Not predicting economic chaos. Haven't found secret of everlasting prosperity yet. Don't think he meant consequences would be same as 1929.

Question (J. J. Rutkowski). Costs for economic expansion tending to be higher, hence lower profits? Answer. Lower profit margins. Not necessarily decline of corporate profits.

Question. Does need for restraint in private demand imply income tax increase for 1966? Answer. Several possibilities: reduction in civilian defense expenditures; restrain growth in private sector via monetary policy; transfer purchasing power from private parties to government by tax increase; direct price-wage controls. Latter is least attractive.

Question (Ian Campbell). Probable developments with respect to country's gold balance in 1966? Answer. President against capital outflow to foreign nations. Urged guidelines. As result, balance-of-payments deficit showed some improvement, even though gold outflow larger than 1964. Might have same difficulties in 1966. Reasons: Vietnam; foreign aid; bank lending overseas (portfolio funds). All improvements behind us—none foreseen for 1966.

Question (Lloyd Graybiel). How much gold will we lose in 1966 and will it weaken confidence in dollar? Answer. Vietnam will probably impose additional strain. Possible balance-of-payments deficit around $2 billion. Europe may be more willing to help finance deficit. France has made most of her conversions. Loss of gold in 1966 probably under $1 billion.

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1966, Lt. Gen. Robert W. Colglazier will retire, culminating a brilliant and distinguished career of more than 41 years service in the U.S. Army.

I rise today to congratulate and commend General Colglazier for his outstanding leadership and service to this Nation. He is admired and respected both on a national level and a local level for his contributions to his fellow man.

I am proud to say that General Colglazier is a product of San Antonio, having attended high school and later serving as president of the Colglazier McKennon Construction Co. there. It is fitting and proper that we should honor him upon the occasion of his retirement, for he deserves the gratitude of each of us.

In 1925 he graduated from Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College with a B.S. in Civil Engineering. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Officers Reserve Corps on October 26, 1925.

Prior to World War II, General Colglazier was an officer in the construction firm of Colglazier & Hoff, Inc., in San Antonio, Tex.

In May 1941, General Colglazier was called to extended active duty and assigned to the Office of the Quartermaster General as assistant executive officer in the engineering branch, construction division.

General Colglazier was transferred to the North Ireland Base Command in January 1942, and placed in charge of construction there. For his outstanding service at the North Ireland Base Command, he was awarded the Legion of Merit. In November 1942, he was assigned as assistant executive of the engineering section, Mediterranean Base section; the following February he became chief of staff of the Eastern Base section in the North African Theater of Operations. For his planning, organization and direction of the numerous activities of the headquarters staff during and subsequent to the Tunisian campaign, General Colglazier was awarded his first Oak Leaf Cluster to the Legion of Merit. In October 1943 he was appointed assistant chief of staff for supply of the Peninsular Base section in Italy.

In July 1944, General Colglazier became Assistant Chief of Staff for supply of the Communications Zone, Mediterranean theater, and in November 1944 assumed that position with the headquarters of the southern line of communications, European theater. In order to meet the problems of the newly organized southern line of communications, he formulated the policies and procedures for assuring an adequate flow of supplies and services to the combat elements of 6th Army group under constantly changing circumstances caused by a rapidly moving tactical situation. For this significant contribution to the allied war effort, General Golglazier was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. From February to October 1945 he was Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for supply of the Army Headquarters in the European theater. During this period he was awarded a second Oak Leaf Cluster for the Legion of Merit.

General Golglazier was relieved of active duty on March 1, 1946, and returned to San Antonio, where he became president of the Golglazier McKennon Construction Co.

In July 1951, after the start of the Korean war, General Golglazier was recalled to extended active duty and appointed Chief of the control office in the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, Logistics, at Army headquarters. In July 1953 he was named Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G-4, for plans and programs. He was appointed director of programs and budget, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics in September 1954 and was subsequently named as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics.

In January 1956, he was assigned to headquarters, U.S. Army Europe, reporting in April 1956, as commanding general, U.S. Army Europe, Communications Zone.

General Golglazier returned to headquarters, Department of the Army, in December 1957 and was again designated the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics. In July 1959 General Golglazier became the Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Department of the Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

It is significant to note that he has also been honored internationally. Among his citations and decorations for distinguished service are the Legion of Merit (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), the Bronze Star Medal, the Army Commendation Ribbon with metal pendant. The Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre were awarded him by France and in recognition of his outstanding service during World War II, the Honorary Officer of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, was awarded him by England.

The Golden Touch of Julius Abernethy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the January 1966 issue of Modern Textiles magazine presented a very interesting article on the life and works of Julius Whitener Abernethy, of Newton, N.C.

Julius Abernethy has contributed tremendously to the industrial, educational, and religious development of our State and Nation. He has consistently contributed his talents and resources to worthwhile activities in a manner seldom seen anywhere.

The privilege that I have had to be intimately associated with this outstanding North Carolinian is one of the finest opportunities that could come to any person. His warmth of personality and his genuine attitude and friendliness has meant a great deal to me as an individual. Hundreds of others have been similarly favored.

Since this article entitled "The Golden Touch of Julius Abernethy" tells the story of the American free enterprise system in a very tangible way, I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of the RECORD for today in order that many Americans will have an opportunity to read it.

THE GOLDEN TOUCH OF JULIUS ABERNETHY

A few months ago textile management people were startled to learn that Whitin Machine Works, long-established, solidly respected maker of varn preparatory machinery, was going through the agony of being up for sale. Longtime holders of large blocks of shares, descendants mostly of the original founders of the company, were said to be interested in disposing of their stock.

Whitin was a prize more than one growth-minded company seemed anxious to acquire. One contender, White Consolidated Industries, of Cleveland, seemed closest to getting control. Among the flood of rumors, the movements and countermovements of the contenders, it became apparent that someone outside the Whitin family owned something like 90,000 shares of Whitin and that the purchase of these shares, if it could be managed, would give control of the situation to the purchaser.

Who is the group that has ownership of 90,000 shares of Whitin Machine Works and where can it be found? This was the question that White Consolidated executives asked as they summed up their chances of getting enough stock to control Whitin. The answer, they learned, was through a man named Julius Whitener Abernethy who could be found almost any day in his little office in a little white cottage just off the town square of a small place in North Carolina named Newton.

The White Consolidated people lost no time in getting down to North Carolina to make the acquaintance of the mysterious Mr. Abernethy. As it so happened, they got together with him not in his little white cottage in Newton but in his comfortable summer home at Blowing Rock in the mountains of western North Carolina. There they sat with Julius Abernethy on his veranda overlooking the pretty scenery of the Great Smokies and talked and talked about their interest in acquiring the 90,000 shares of

Whitin. After 5 or 6 hours of talk pleasantly interrupted now and then to take some food and drink, an agreement was reached. Abernethy committed for the owning group 90,646 shares of Whitin Machine Works to White Consolidated for $37.50 a share or a total of something like $3.4 million.

While the Abernethy interest in Whitin thus ended, its participation in Roberts Co. was proving successful. In August 1964, he headed a private group that purchased $3 million subordinated debentures and 200,000 shares of Roberts' stock at the then market price of $4 a share, and Julius Abernethy became a director and chairman of the finance committee.

In November 1965, within days after receiving payment for its Whitin holdings, the Abernethy group privately purchased from Roberts $3 million subordinated nonconvertible debentures and 30,000 shares at $14 a share to where Roberts had then advanced. As this goes to press in early December, Roberts is quoted around $22 a share.

Julius Abernethy's involvement with the Roberts organization highlights the important part he plays in the industrial scene. Roberts had the products, the people, and the know-how but needed the financial backing which Abernethy's vision recognized.

Robert E. Pomeranz, Roberts' founder and president, stated recently, "Julius Abernethy is the most constructive man I have ever known. He is a builder and backs up his beliefs in a realistic and imaginative manner. Everything he touches expands. Everyone he meets improves financially. Nothing and nobody remains the same as before meeting him."

These two stories mark on one hand the end of control of a 75-year-old machinery maker by its founding family and the ascending star of a new machinery maker. They bring to sharp focus for the entire industry and for many in the broader financial world as well the personality and career of Julius Abernethy. He is a man who in the past, out of modesty and humility, had always tried to avoid aggrandizing publicity. This is not to say, of course, that he was unknown. On the contrary, to many in the textile industry, especially in the Carolinas, Abernethy for decades has been well known and deeply respected.

The respect felt for him was based upon two elements: Abernethy's uncanny ability to make money for himself and his friends in buying and selling textile stocks and his vast generosity—usually kept very quiet—to churches and church-related colleges and many other worthy causes. Julius Abernethy has been described as "an original." A close business associate and admirer says when they made Uncle Julius "they broke the mold. There will never be another like him." Abernethy himself will tell you that he has also been called a "lone wolf"—a man who goes his own way without regard to the trend of the moment, making his own decisions according to his own best lights.

For the most part these decisions, generally concerned with buying and selling stocks in textile companies, have been remarkably right. They have caused Abernethy to become one of the richest men in the Carolinas, and a man held in awe for his astuteness in making his investments yield larger and larger returns. It is said in and around Newton, and indeed even in wider circles, that he has many followers—men and women who find out what Julius Abernethy is buying in the way of textile stocks or other securities and go and do likewise. How do they learn what he is buying? Some of the more devious find out. Abernethy says, "by asking around." Others, more direct and also perhaps because they know him personally, ask him pointblank what is a good investment. To such queries, Uncle Julius has a fixed answer. "I say to them, I won't tell you what to buy (I never give such advice) but I will tell you what I'm buying."

Putting it another way, there is nothing secretive about Julius Abernethy. He is an open man, known to everyone in Newton and elsewhere in textile country and it is easy to see him. The door of his office in his little white cottage in Newton has a sign on it: "Walk In." People do every day and they find him sitting at his desk, a long cigar in his mouth, ready to talk friendly sense to any man.

The secret of Julius Abernethy's great success as an investor, according to his nephew, friend, and business associate, Jack Thompson, treasurer of Carolina Mills, is his faith in textiles. Uncle Julius, Thompson says, bought stocks in mills from the 1930's on during the years when confidence in textiles on the part of business men and the investing public was at a low ebb. It was Abernethy's conviction that textile stocks were the best buy on the speculative securities market.

He bought and bought, Thompson says. To do so he pyramided his holdings, putting up what he had in stocks as collateral to buy more stocks. Abernethy, like so many successful men in industry and finance, is not afraid to borrow when he sees a chance to make a promising investment. He has little use for cash. Cash money is something he likes to put to work as fast as possible to buy something at a low price that he expects to climb soon to a higher price. And in this manner he has built his fortune—by exercising his remarkable skill as a trader. Those who know him well are quick to make this point about his investment operations: Julius Abernethy always acts on the principle that there is plenty for everybody. He uses his own money to buy large blocks of stocks in companies. To his friends he offers these stocks at his purchase price even though the stock may have gone up since he bought it. What is left he keeps for himself.

The man who has become well known in textiles and beyond as one of the successful traders of his time was apparently born with this gift. That event took place on July 4, 1894, in Hickory, a town in the westerly part of North Carolina where the rolling country of the Piedmont gets more hilly with the approach of the Smokies still farther west. His father, Julius Franklin Abernethy, was a country storekeeper who also ran a livery stable. Abernethy himself says today that he gets his trading instinct from his father. Inherited or not, this instinct began to show itself at an early age. While still a child, the younger Julius Abernethy began to trade with profit to himself in such items valuable to small boys in a country town at the turn of the century as marbles, pigeons, pocketknives, bicycles and—so the legend in the Abernethy family goes—frogs.

From such part-time trading, Abernethy by the time he was 15 and a graduate of the seventh grade in the local school had moved on to the world of serious business. At that tender age, he was running a local flour mill, by name, he now remembers, the Hickory Rolling Mills, taking part of the flour in return for his services. Within a few years, however, Abernethy had found his way into a business where his innate abilities as a trader had full sway. He bought bankrupt merchandise including at times the shops, fixtures, and buildings that housed them. Some of these stores he liquidated, transferring the stocks to retail outlets elsewhere. Others he rehabilitated and kept in operation. In no time at all he had stores in Newton, Lenoir, Hickory, and many other towns in his native State.

So successful was the youthful Abernethy as a merchant that in 1915 he sold out his store interests of the moment for a net yield of $60,000. He then moved to Newton where he opened Abernethy's Cash Store, selling at bargain prices an assortment of apparel and short lengths of yard goods he picked up in job lots in Baltimore, New York, and other clothing centers and from mills in the Carolinas. An example of his merchandising skill during those years was his practice of buying at low prices tailormade suits, rejected by their original would-be buyers. Abernethy sold these high class garments in his store for a small profit. Short lengths of yard goods he sold at a profit of a penny a yard.

In 1917, Abernethy gave up being a businessman—or so he expected—to enlist in the Army as a private ready for combat service. But to his disappointment, the Army, scanning his enlistment questionnaire, learned that he had experience as a buyer of merchandise of all kinds. Fitting, for once, the right man to the right job, the Army promptly commissioned him as a lieutenant and assigned him to a Washington procurement office. From there he was sent out scouring nearby cities for badly needed items of apparel such as underwear and such sundries as combs, brushes, and shoelaces.

Riding in a motorcar with a general by his side to give sanction to his mission and followed by a fleet of trucks, he descended on jobbers and wholesalers, commandeered their stocks of things the Army wanted for the hundreds of thousands of men it was shipping to France. Buying with a knowing eye, Abernethy saw that the suppliers got fair prices, and maybe a little more, for their wanted goods. Although the jobbers hated to see him come, none could complain afterward that he was not treated fairly.

After Abernethy left the Army in 1920, he resumed his career in the Carolinas as a merchant, setting up stores, buying bankrupt merchandise and liquidating other stores when it seemed the best course. In 7 years he bought and reshuffled some 25 stores. He worked closely at that time with Henry Belk, founder of the Belk chain of department stores so well known in the Piedmont today.

Gradually as time went on, Julius Abernethy moved into the field that was to be his greatest area of success—the buying and selling, the "trading," as he calls it, of textile mill stocks. Over the years, he had bought and sold stocks in innumerable mills. In some cases the mills in which he held stock were merged with others, or liquidated. In other cases, they were strengthened and expanded.

Among mills with which he has been closely associated as a heavy shareholder have been Mooresville of which he was president at the time it was merged with Burlington; American Efird; Textiles, Inc.; Fulton Bag & Cotton Co. At one time, the fast-moving Abernethy owned one-third of the stock of Burlington Industries, which, incidentally, he bought at $30 a share and sold at $90. Today he is the largest 'outside" stockholder in Dan River Mills.

Among textile mills in which he has had interests, a very special place in his affections is held by Carolina Mills with plants at Newton, Lincolnton, Gastonia, Hickory, Maiden, and Statesville. For many years, Abernethy was president of Carolina—an active, working millman, keenly interested in the mill's day-to-day operations, deeply respected by its employees. He stepped down as president in 1960, but still serves as chairman of the board.

These days, in the 72d year of his life, Abernethy remains, as in the past, a man deeply involved in the buying and selling of stocks; he trades as instinctively as a bee makes honey. According to those who know him best, his mind is always working, analyzing endlessly the various possibilities of buying and selling stocks at a profit that may seem most urgent, most promising of success. From these ceaseless reflections, these silent ruminations, he reaches the decisions on which he acts daily and hourly—decisions which results in a word or two to his nephew, Claude S. Abernethy, Jr., with whom he shares an office: "Buy so many shares of such-and-such. Or sell so-many shares." Claude, who is vice president of Interstate Securities Corp., a member of the New York Stock Exchange, is able at once to put Uncle Julius' decisions into effect.

Moneymaking is thus an instinctual, 24-hour-a-day activity for Abernethy; it must be recorded, however, that as fast as he makes money he gives it away. Unlike his activities in the business world, which have always been open for all to see, his gifts to worthy causes are performed with as little publicity as he can manage. During the last 15 years or so, he has given away 3 or 4 million dollars. He says, "I expect to give away that much during the next 4 or 5 years."

Among the major recipients of Abernethy's generosity have been many church-related schools and colleges in the Carolinas and many churches. In Statesville, people like to recall that when the Front Street Baptist Church burned down in 1945 without a dollar in insurance, Julius Abernethy matched with a dollar every dollar the church raised on its own behalf for a new structure. Today the Front Street Church has been rebuilt with a bigger and more useful structure and has built also a bigger congregation to fill it. And this kind of help to a church near one of the mills in which he is interested is not an isolated case. Over the years, Abernethy has encouraged management in mills in which he had interests to contribute generously to churches of various denominations in their respective home communities. Currently, Abernethy has assumed personal responsibility for the construction of Negro churches in Newton and Hickory—churches now nearing completion.

Another example of his giving to worthy cause has been his help with money of a Methodist Church in Newton. His generous support led the trustees to adapt for the church the name Abernethy Memorial Church. Also in Newton, Abernethy's support has enabled the United Church of Christ to build a handsome commodious educational wing, the Abernethy Fellowship.

The financial support and encouragement of religious groups is only one of Abernethy's activities as a benefactor. He is also generous with both money and wise counsel to many educational institutions. To mention a few examples, he was recently appointed to the board of trustees and also to a directorship of Crossnore School in Avery County, N.C. In this school two out of three of the students are either orphans or children of broken homes.

He is a director of the visiting board of Davidson College.

For Julius Abernethy, the regular and generous giving away of his money to religious groups—"tithing," old-fashioned churchgoers call it—is a solemn obligation arising from his religious convictions. Nevertheless, there is a lighter side to his persistent giving to religious organizations. "The more I give away," he says, "the more I make."

It would be a mistake in summing up the life story of Julius Abernethy to leave the impression that he has been nothing more than a man with an unusual gift for successful trading and thus for making money. His achievement has been far more beneficial. The fact of the matter is that he has been more than simply a buyer and seller of textile stocks. His activities along these lines over the years have resulted in much good both for the individual companies in which he has invested and for the textile industry as a whole. He has been instrumental in merging and in liquidating smaller, obsolete mills, generally to the advantage of the stockholders, many of whom have been small investors and people who needed someone to protect their interests. In other cases, where such a course has seemed wise and promising of prosperity, he has strengthened and modernized mills into which he has bought.

In summing up his long career as the textile industry's unique trader in mill stocks, it can indeed be said that he is, as he has often been described, "an industrialist." But he is an industrialist of a rare and vanishing kind: a rugged individualist, a solitary operator, a "loner" in the sense of a man who goes his own way regardless of the prevailing winds of opinion. But he is also a rugged individualist with a generous heart; a man of deep religious beliefs who gives to church groups, and other worthy causes a great deal of the money his acumen as a trader has brought him.

The Bureaucracy and Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to call attention to a drastic change in policy by the Social Security Administration, in regard to establishing proof of eligibility for medicare enrollment, by senior citizens not already drawing social security. That change in policy, in essence, was forcing thousands of senior citizens who possessed so-called delayed birth certificates to first obtain a Bureau of Census records check and to pay $5 for an expedited investigation. After my discussions with the Social Security Administration, I issued the following statement on January 6:

HOW JOHNSON REDTAPE RAISES COST OF MEDICARE

> Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican of Missouri, said today that several million senior citizens are being required to dig into their pockets to finance an administration change in policy which assumes that many older people were "hatched" instead of born.
>
> Hall said the new policy, which was made effective on November 22, but not published in the Federal Register until almost a month later, will add an immense ball of redtape to the procedures required for older citizens to qualify for medicare and other social security benefits. It also could take several million dollars out of the pockets of our senior citizens who can least afford it.
>
> Hall said the new policy could affect millions of older people who were born before there were established procedures in the various States for requiring birth certification. In many States, in fact in most of them, no birth records were kept before 1910, or even later. In the past, the Social Security Administration has accepted what are known as delayed birth certificates, affidavits signed by their parents or other knowledgeable people attesting to their date of birth. Under the new policy, these affidavits are no longer acceptable as proof of birth, either for medicare enrollees, or for anyone else reaching age 65 and applying for regular social security benefits.
>
> Before these delayed birth certificates will be accepted, the new Johnson policy, in essence, requires that the applicant or enrollee first request a check with the Bureau of the Census records, and for such an investigation at the present time there is a charge of $5 for each inquiry.
>
> Its understandable to charge for such an investigation for the person's own use, but, certainly, not when the Government policy, itself, may require it. That should be a service which the agency provides since they're the ones that require it.
>
> Furthermore, there is no clear-cut policy at this time with regard to waiver of payment by the individual. At the moment, it's left to the discretion of each social security office, whether the individual or the agency will pay the cost, and none of the older citizens who have contacted me were advised of any possibility of waiver. Such a policy is fraught with possibilities of political favoritism. It ought to be revised.
>
> The agency, itself, admits there has been a wave of protest as a result of the current procedure. Under such pressures, I believe the Social Security Administration will want to reverse its position.
>
> In view of this fluid situation, I am advising my constituents, who do not have the newly required birth data, to make no further moves now, and certainly not to pay the $5 until the Social Security Administration has been given reasonable opportunity to reconsider its policy.
>
> Hall said the new requirement will place a huge workload on the Census Bureau over the next few years, and there will certainly be an increase in administrative costs of the Bureau of Census.
>
> Aside from the monetary consideration, there is the matter of considerable inconvenience, redtape, and exasperation for older people who had no idea that their delayed birth certificates would no longer suffice as proof they were indeed born.
>
> Hall has filed a protest with the Social Security Administration, and has urged that the policy be relaxed or rescinded, until Congress has an opportunity for further investigation as to its propriety.
>
> This new and largely unpublicized provision comes as a shock to many older citizens who have had to find out the hard way. Furthermore, this problem, if it is a problem, should and could have been anticipated, without causing the bureaucratic turmoil now evident. It's the type of thing that many Members of Congress warned about and I'm afraid only a forerunner of other problems, perhaps far more serious in the administration of the new program.
>
> This example of expensive redtape is another reason why I thought eldercare was far preferable to medicare.

Shortly after I issued the foregoing statement to the news media, a representative of the Social Security Administration called at my office for a copy, which was provided.

In the Great Society, the first instinct of a bureaucrat is to protect his public image, and so it came as no great surprise to me that, like Pavlov's dogs, the Social Security Administration denied the charge and indicated they were following the same policy they had followed for years. The following is the Associated Press story, item 98 on the AP wire, which was carried at 1:45 p.m. on the afternoon of January 6. The wire story follows:

> A Social Security Administration spokesman said the agency does not require use of census records to establish the age of persons who do not have a birth or baptismal document, though that is one of several ways suggested in such cases.
>
> The spokesman said this procedure has been followed for years.
>
> The only recent change in policy regarding proof of age, the spokesman said, puts emphasis on use of the earliest available

documents, particularly those apparently establishing age before the person reached the age of 10.

When I was advised of this denial, which I knew to be false, I urged the wire services to keep me advised of any further statement on the subject that might be issued by the Social Security Administration. Not long afterward, I learned that another statement on the subject was to be issued by the Social Security Administrator. The next sequence of this incredible chain of events was recorded on UPI story No. 181, which was carried at 7:12 p.m. on the evening of January 6. The story speaks for itself and follows:

The Social Security Administration, which since November 22 has been asking benefit applicants for better proof of birth date, conceded today the new rules weren't working too well.

Commissioner Robert M. Ball announced, therefore, he was changing them to avert long delays in getting on to pension or medicare rolls. Hereafter the "best available proof" will be accepted, and verification sought later.

Ball made his announcement several hours after Representative Durward G. Hall, Republican, of Missouri, charged that the recent rule-tightening apparently was based on an assumption older people were "hatched" and not born.

Those affected are persons without formal birth certificates issued by local government authorities. At the time of birth of many of those now reaching age 65, birth certificates were not being issued.

In their absence the Social Security Administration always has accepted alternative evidence, including so-called "delayed birth certificates" based on affidavits of parents or other knowledgeable persons.

With increased benefits made available, by the medicare bill passed by Congress last year, Ball said the agency decided to tighten the procedures to make sure the public interest was protected.

Under the rule put into effect on November 22, where an alternative document was presented in lieu of a birth certificate, at least one supporting document was required. Hall, in his statement, said in effect this meant that applicants had to apply for a check of old census records. He said this kind of search takes as long as 2 or 3 months. The cost to the applicant, the Congressman said, was $5.

Ball said that under procedure announced today, the applicants evidence of birth date will be accepted and the applicant placed on the roll. Then the agency itself will check the Census Bureau and pay for the cost of the search.

In an event, an agency spokesman said, any applicant delayed in getting onto the benefit rolls will be paid retroactively once his claim is established.

Representative Hall said he was pleased. He said he will keep watch, however, to make sure the latest word gets out fast to all the Social Security offices over the country.

Subsequently, I issued the following statement:

GREAT SOCIETY PAIN RELIEVED—FAST

Representative Durward Hall, Republican, of Missouri, today stated that as a result of his protest, the Johnson administration has agreed to cut the miles of redtape entangling senior citizens in their efforts to participate in medicare and other social security benefits.

Representative Hall aired his views on "Comment," the weekly radio news program of the Republican National Committee.

The following is the text of the Congressman's remarks:

"Of course, it's a source of great satisfaction to me that the Social Security Commissioner has responded to my strong protest about the new rules which were forcing hundreds of thousands of our senior citizens to go to the extra expense and a great deal of inconvenience to establish their birth dates and thus qualify for medicare and other social security benefits.

"As a result of our protest, based on numerous complaints I received from older citizens, I am happy to say that the new rules which ruled out initial acceptance of the so-called delayed birth certificates, and usually required a $5 payment for a records examination by the Census Bureau, were rescinded.

"Meanwhile, I know that our senior citizens around the country, most of whom do not have an original birth certificate but are sure they were born and not hatched, simply because few States had such certificates back in the early 1900's, are happy to know that they will not have to undergo undue delay during the signup period. Nor will they have to pay for the Census Bureau examination, the cost of which will now be borne by the Social Security Administration, when and if they require it, albeit not the intent of the Congress."

As a footnote to all this, I might add a few comments. First, as of this date, I still have received no formal reply to my written inquiry of January 4 to Commissioner Ball. My last acknowledgement was an interim reply on January 12, indicating that my letter was receiving official attention. So far as I know, the social security announcement on the evening of January 6 gave no indication that the policy was being changed as a result of my complaint and some of the news stories carried by the local press left the implication that the administration was trying to make it easier for senior citizens to enroll for medicare, without any admission that they were reversing a previously imposed policy, which had made enrollment more difficult, costly, and exasperating for senior citizens. I believe the House will be interested in this article by Ralph de Toledano written for King Features Syndicate before he was aware of the agency response:

MEDICARE HAS BEGUN TO WRITE OFF THE SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Ralph de Toledano)

When medicare was dangled before the Nation's senior citizens, it was billed as a royal road to free hospital care. But the bureaucrats have moved in and made it a redtape snarl that will make it difficult for those without means to get the help they were promised.

Representative Durward G. Hall, who has been both literally and figuratively from Missouri on the issue, has discovered what the medicare division of social security has been quietly doing to make life difficult for the aged—and to extract several millions of dollars from thier pockets.

Rules and regulations for receiving medicare benefits were quietly put into effect, without the usual publication in the Federal Register, much to the annoyance and chagrin of those who lined up at Social Security Administration offices to qualify for benefits. Only a month after these regulations were in force was it considered important to let the country in on the facts.

This is the background:

In the past, those seeking regular social security benefits were not required to present birth certificates. It was recognized by Federal authorities that most States did not keep birth records before 1910. Arizona did not become a State until 1912, and Territorial records were, to say the least, spotty. The Social Security Administration was perfectly satisfied with affidavits (known as delayed birth certificates) from responsibile sources as to the age of the applicant.

Under the new policy, Representative Hall has pointed out, these affidavits are no longer acceptable as proof of birth—either for medicare enrollees or for anyone else reaching age 65 and applying for the regular social security to which he has been contributing.

"Before these delayed birth certificates will be accepted," "Doc" Hall points out, "the new Johnson policy in essence requires that the enrollee or applicant first request a check with the Census Bureau records, and for such a check at the present time there is a charge of $5 for each check."

Social Security Administration officials, moreover, have consistently failed to inform applicants without birth certificates that it may be possible to waive the $5 fee. Get the certificate and pay up the $5, or else, is the attitude of those administering the program. In instances where no birth certificate exists, the check by the Census Bureau will be meaningless—throwing a tremendous new workload on the Government.

The flood of applications, moreover, will delay payment of medicare and social security benefits to those in need who were presumably the thoughtful concern of Congress and the administration. The utter futility of the new regulations is patent since most of those applying for medicare can demonstrate that they are well past the age to qualify.

"This new and unpublicized provision comes as a shock to many older citizens who have had to find out the hard way." Representative Hall says, and he has formally protested to the Social Security Administration. "This problem should and could have been anticipated, without causing the bureaucratic turmoil now evident It's the type of thing that many Members of Congress warned about, and I'm afraid only a forerunner of other problems, perhaps far more serious in the administration of the new program."

What remains to be determined is what great brain in the Federal bureaucracy thought of this new regulation and why it was not given the proper publicity. This touches on one aspect of Federal activity that is callously forgotten by those who pile law on law. Once a government enters into relations with the individual, rights and conveniences are forgotten. The bureaucracy thinks in terms of masses, and people are reduced to helpless statistics. Government funds to pay hospital bills for the aged, on its face, seems like a noble idea. But when you get right down to it, the individual finds himself standing on endless lines, at the disposal of harried and overworked people whose interest is more in the job than in those who are presumably its beneficiaries.

"Doc" Hall is right to be angered by this new piece of Federal redtape. Those who were led to believe that it would help them may learn there is a bill for everything—whether it be in money or in frustration.

The Record of the 89th Congress by Nathan Voloshen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks I include a splendid address by Nathan P. Voloshen, legislative representative of the Distillery, Rectifying, Wine & Allied Workers of America on the record of the 89th Congress. This address is an excellent presentation of the accomplishments of the historic 89th Congress.

THE RECORD OF THE 89TH CONGRESS

(By Nathan Voloshen)

It was just about a year ago, as you may recall, that we were on the verge of a national election in which the social gains of the past 30 years—and, indeed, the economic, social, and poltical order of our country—were at stake.

In view of President Johnson's overwhelming victory in November, it is perhaps a little difficult to remember just how great a threat Senator Goldwater's candidacy represented. The Monday morning quarterbacks and the political pontifs join in assuring us that even if he had been elected—and they pooh-pooh the very notion that he might have been elected—that things would not have been very much different. I think that anyone with an ounce of intelligence can successfully dispute that notion. The bills enacted by the current session of Congress give the lie to those who say that the choice of a President matters little in the overall policy of the Government.

JOHNSON'S PROGRAM

Not only would we not have the kind of leadership that President Johnson has been demonstrating with unabated vigor since his election, but we would have had a desperate struggle to maintain the social gains that are part of the very fabric of society. By his actions the architect of the Great Society has demonstrated his thorough commitment to liberal and progressive goals, and on the basic issues of his program—a program which coincides with that of the AFL–CIO—he has neither faltered nor compromised.

The will of the people, so strongly expressed last November, has been translated with unparalleled speed and scope—thanks largely to the direction given by President Johnson and the leadership in Congress of Speaker JOHN McCORMACK and Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD—into legislative action. And what a legislative record it is. The 89th Congress has written an indelible chapter in American history and has opened the way to a better life for the generations now alive and those yet to be born.

"HISTORIC" SESSION

The number and variety of legislative enactments have been so great that the very adjective "historic" has become a cliche. This is not to say that Congress has enacted in haste and without exercising considered judgment in every bill. In contrast to the famous 100 days of the New Deal in 1933—a session which, until now, was not challenged as the most productive in history—this Congress has not been under the pressure of an economic emergency. It has undertaken the task of social reform as a deliberate obligation. With the exception of the repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley—an issue to which I shall return shortly—it has weighed each proposal, modifying some and strengthening others.

In a word, the 89th Congress has reflected the spirit of President Johnson's campaigin in 1964—the first campaign in history in which an incumbent President, running at a time of unsurpassed prosperity, based his largest appeal upon the needs of the unprosperous minority.

We in the DWU—and in the labor movement as a whole— gave full support to that campaign and that appeal. The results have more than justified our confidence, and the confidence expressed by the American people as a whole, in voting for that program and in electing a President and a Congress capable of carrying it forward to success.

Let us now turn to the record, and in so doing perhaps we can follow the example of President Johnson who—prior to leaving the hospital after surgery last month—proudly ticked off the record.

EDUCATION

For understandable reasons, our Chief Executive started with education. The importance of education for our Nation can never be minimized. And it is a matter of historical record that when the labor movement first came into being a century and a half ago, agitation for the creation of a free public school system was first in its demands.

Exactly 1 year ago, President Johnson suggested that the 88th Congress, because of its contributions in that field, could properly be termed the "Education Congress." In my estimation the 89th Congress has an even greater claim to the title. After long years of futile effort, it enacted the first program of general Federal aid to primary and secondary schools in this country's 177-year history. For this act alone the children and the grandchildren of every American family—and their own children yet to come—will have reason to remember the 89th Congress.

But this was not the only education measure adopted. In literally every aspect of schooling—prekindergarten to college, vocational and professional, disadvantaged adult and aspiring postgraduate—existing programs were strengthened and new ones started.

MEDICARE

Only education, with its tremendous long-range importance to American society, could be mentioned before the epic victory of medicare. This is a brilliant example of the congressional approach I mentioned a moment ago. For it was the Congress which took our modest proposal—the legislative demand of the AFL–CIO which was given a No. 1 priority by the DWU at the San Francisco convention in May 1964—and, impressed by the needs of the elderly, added to it a plan for covering other medical expenses as well. This great new breakthrough, coupled with higher retirement benefits and other improvements, brings real meaning to the concept of old-age security.

Third on Johnson's list was the war on poverty. The conscious effort to attack poverty and its causes is both praiseworthy and unprecedented. Best of all, it seems to me, has been the eager response of young people to that goal. We have learned again that unashamed idealism, the quest for progress and even for perfection, can awaken in American youth the spirit that we like to think of as uniquely American.

The effort to bring more and more Americans out of their poverty and into the mainstream of American affluence is associated with an effort to rehabilitate areas that have suffered from economic catastrophes that were not of their own making. Because not a few of our members come from such areas, we in the DWU were among the earliest supporters of the concept of area development. We are delighted that Congress, in the face of tremendous pressure, moved to strengthen the program rather than write it off.

The $19 billion cut in income and excise taxes has more than justified itself in terms of maintaining the high level of our economy without interruption. This measure, coupled with other steps taken by the Government to bolster the economy, makes it overwhelmingly clear that never again will the Federal Government turn its back on the Nation's economic plight and trust to the workings of the so-called free market, as President Herbert Hoover tried to do in the days of the great depression.

CIVIL RIGHTS

I have deferred mentioning civil rights until now, not because it is less important—quite the contrary—but rather because the great civil rights breakthrough is properly associated with the previous Congress. But on this front, too, the 89th Congress has been prompt to move. The voting rights bill should at last insure the rights of every American to full citizenship. The equal employment opportunities section of the 1964 act is certain to be strengthened. In a word, Congress has reaffirmed the determination of the American people that ancient injustices will no longer be allowed to tarnish the American ideal of the equality of man.

The orderly struggle of the past year and of the decade before that for civil rights has seen the AFL–CIO and civil rights organizations stand shoulder to shoulder in the fight for freedom and progress for all Americans. But civil rights, let me remind you, is just a key. It will open the gates only for those who are willing to shoulder the responsibilities as well as the rights that it offers. It cannot reverse at once those melancholy currents by which millions are swept along—in slum houses, in crowded schools, in the desolate streets where unemployment and boredom lead hopeless men to crime and violence.

The death of hope where hope existed, and the sense of failure to change the conditions of life—these things no doubt lead to riots, such as we had in the Watts district of Los Angeles last August. But, as President Johnson said at that time, they did not justify such an outbreak. We shall never achieve a free and prosperous and hopeful society until we have suppressed the fires of hate and we have turned aside from violence—whether violence comes from the night riders of the Klan, or the snipers and the looters in the Watts district. Neither old wrongs nor new fears can ever justify arson or murder.

Yet beneath the discord we hear another theme—a theme to which we in the DWU are in complete accord and to which we will make our contribution. That theme speaks of a day—of a day when Americans of every color, and every creed, and every religion, and every region, and every sex can be trained for decent employment, can find it, can secure it, can have it preserved, and can support their families in an enriching and a rewarding environment.

MERELY A START

This then, is the legislative record of the 1st session of the 89th Congress, even though no brief summary can do justice to it. It would seem, off-hand, to close the books on the period that began with Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal in 1933, that merged into Harry S. Truman's Fair Deal ending in 1952, that stood still during the 8 years of Dwight D. Eisenhower, but that had a flaming new birth with the brilliance of the John F. Kennedy years and that now has reached a climax with the domestic triumphs of the Johnson administration.

These triumphs would make it almost seem that the President has no more worlds to conquer. Yet any candid examination of what the American people have accomplished through the work of the 89th Congress would underscore what is, in fact, only a prelude to the new dimension of the tasks that face them, as President Brandenburg told us earlier today, in a world that is changing with dramatic speed and, that is bringing new challenges every day of the week.

SECTION 14(b)

Certainly for the organized labor movement the period ahead, far from being the culmination of the struggle for social justice and economic security, is merely a beginning. So long as section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—the spawning-ground for 19 State laws forbidding the union shop—remains on the books, there will be a drag not only upon organized labor but also on American society. History has shown that a strong, effective trade union movement is the buttress for a strong, effective America. We had the votes in the Senate to end Taft-Hartley if the issue came to a vote. But the resistance of a hard-core, antilabor minority—armed with the weapon of filibuster in the Senate and capitalizing on the desire of Congress to go home—stood in the way. We lost this round but the battle goes on.

WAGE-HOUR IMPROVEMENT

Badly needed improvements in the wage-hour law—probably the most powerful weapon in the war on poverty—are also essential. We may have to wait until next year to raise the Federal minimum wage and extend it to additional millions of workers. The House Labor Committee, under the chairmanship of Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who spearheaded most of the antipoverty legislation in this session, has already recommended an increase from $1.25 to $1.75 an hour. It has also stated that extension of coverage to 8 million additional workers is necessary for the humanitarian goal of helping large groups of workers whose earnings today are unjustly and disproportionately low.

There is need, too, for a major overhaul of the workmen's compensation system. Federal workmen's compensation legislation is imperative if injured workers and their families are to receive protection that is commensurate with the standards of a Great Society. Recent years have seen few major improvements in State workmen's compensation statutes and prospects are dim for reform on the State level. Federal minimum standards are essential to bring them up to a realistic level of adequacy.

MAKING LAWS WORK

The first is to see to it that these great new undertakings of the 89th Congress, which we in organized labor have advocated for so many years and echoed in many regards the resolutions we adopted at our last convention—these statutes must fulfill their goals. A good law on the statute books is not enough; it has to work.

This point has been stressed with respect to civil rights, and especially the equal opportunity section which we did so much to create. But it applies to every aspect of the drive toward that Great Society. It applies to the war on poverty, to the educational programs, to the goal of jobs at good wages for all—to all of them.

POLITICAL ACTION

Our second obligation is one that is too often overlooked in odd-numbered years—and that is political action.

It should be apparent to every member of the DWU in this hall that political action can no longer be left to the few months before each national election.

I have just reviewed with you the record—the pluses as well as the minuses—of the 89th Congress. Why were these pluses possible? Obviously, only because a substantial majority of those who sit in the House and the Senate share our aspirations and agree with our program—a program which we are sure is endorsed by a great majority of our fellow Americans.

Remarkable as that record was, Congress still left much to be desired. We still need the elimination of 14(b). We still need a higher minimum wage and greater coverage under the wage and hour law. We still need a positive program to meet the challenge of automation. These needs must be met by a Congress that is sympathetic to meeting these needs with legislative deeds.

There is no automatic assurance that future Congresses will be in the same pattern as the 89th Congress. Already there is a mood, which was already noticeable when the present session adjourned, for a period of breathtaking and consolidation rather than of sweeping new legislation. And political writers are already taking it for granted that many congressional liberals, especially new Members, will lose their seats to conservatives and reactionaries in 1966.

Perhaps we should take a warning from the lessons of history. President Roosevelt, for example, lost 71 seats in the House of Representatives in 1938 only 2 years after his landslide victory over Alf Landon. And in 1958, just 2 years after his decisive reelection in 1956, General Eisenhower lost 47 House seats.

The political pundits assure us that this is the normal result in nonpresidential years when a President has been swept into office by an impressive mandate. I say that our country cannot afford that kind of normalcy. Any such cuts in liberal strength next year would endanger the Great Society programs and stall progress.

Therefore, the political activity of the DWU—and, indeed, of the labor movement as a whole—must be a continuing function—all year, every year.

Our opponents have grasped this basic fact. Despite their overwhelming repudiation by the people last November, the reactionaries and the rightwing extremists are already starting their campaign for 1966. New organizations have sprung up; new money is being raised; new recruits are being sought.

NO COMPLACENCY

We cannot afford to be complacent, trusting in our conviction that most Americans support the cause of social and economic progress. We must do what we can to emphasize, among our members and among our friends, what this Congress has done and what remains to be done. And we must keep everlasting busy at the basic essentials—supporting our international union's COPE committee and carrying on the endless task of seeing to it that every eligible person is registered to vote—and does vote.

We are now commemorating the silver anniversary of our union and the gains we have made during the past quarter of a century. On the legislative front during the past year, we have had an unprecedented year of legislative progress. Just as we are resolved that the gains of the DWU will continue year after year, so likewise let us resolve that legislative progress will continue year after year—until America is at last a land of unlimited opportunity, security, wellbeing, and freedom for all.

Postal Rate Increase and Wage-Price Guideline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the November 29 issue of the Advertising Age, written by Stanley E. Cohen, the Washington editor, contains some interesting and amusing comments on the wage-price guidelines which affect the Post Office Department. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this article, which follows:

HERE'S FANTASY: HOW TO USE "CLOBBER" TECHNIQUE TO BEAT POSTAL RATE BOOST

(By Stanley E. Cohen)

WASHINGTON, November 24.—"Hey, boss. Got any ambassadorships open?"

Maybe that thought flashed through Postmaster General Larry O'Brien's mind as the administration mobilized to beat off the aluminum price hike.

Former White House staffer O'Brien is supposed to "do something" about the $900 million gap between his department's revenues and expenses. This involves going to Congress next year with a plan to pass along $350 million—or perhaps as much as $500 million—in rate hikes to the Department's patrons.

No matter how he words the message, increases of such size would do violence to the spirit of the wage-price guidelines which President Johnson has defended so faithfully. How does a Government which tells business and labor they must hold the price line go about explaining its own price hikes?

Confronted with this dilemma, Larry recently went to the top. The other day he picked up the white phone—the hot line to the White House.

Larry: "When you sent me here, you promised the presure would be off. But things are rough."

Voice: "Whats' wrong, Larry? After all the arm twisting you had to do for the highway beautification bill, the Post Office must be a picnic."

Larry: "The darnedest things happen. Like the run on 6-cent stamps. We can't print them fast enough."

Voice: "Same thing here with ballpoint pens. I give so many away every time I sign a bill, ballpoint pens have become a leading growth industry."

Larry: "The 6-cent stamp mystery really has us stumped. They're being gobbled up, but nobody is using them."

Voice: "Maybe it's the Ford Foundation—discreetly underwriting your deficit."

Larry: "Talkin about deficits, chief, I've been balancing my books. I'll need a 32-percent rate hike."

Voice: "You know what you were sent there to do."

Larry: "But the guidelines allow only 3.2 percent."

Voice: "Couldn't you drop the decimal point?"

Larry: "The publishers tell me their rate is already up 33 percent since 1960, and parcel post rates have gone through the roof."

Voice: "That was 3 years ago. Right now I need money to take those billboards down, make the rivers swimmable, and build that $10 million aquarium next to the Potomac."

Larry: "Shouldn't we be taking a broader view? Sure the Post Office deficit is bigger. But the Government as a whole is doing fine. We are in our 58th month of continuous economic growth. Taxes are down, spending is up—but deficits are smaller."

Voice: "Your department costs me $900 million which I could spend for something else."

Larry: "Why not take a tip from the Treasury: Cut prices and see what it does to volume?"

Voice: "I can't believe this is the old Larry. Gronouski was a defeatist, too, and talked me into skipping a rate rise this year. Now he's in Poland—in cold storage."

Larry: "What am I supposed to say when newspapers accuse me of profiteering?"

Voice: "Obviously, Larry, you don't understand business. Don't raise rates; get a new product."

Larry: "What's new about delivering mail?"

Voice: "Abolish what you have now—first class 5 cents, airmail 8 cents. Then wrap it in a new package with the tag, 'expedited mail.' Everyone pays 6 cents. Oops, your books still won't balance. Maybe you'd better get 7 cents."

Larry: "It won't work. All letters treated alike sounds communistic. Americans want the opportunity to pay a penny or so more for special stamps. Makes their letters look important."

Voice: "You could have another class: 'Security mail.' "

Larry: "What's that?"

Voice: "Customers pay a dime. The clerk reads the address twice. Assures a fighting chance to get the letter to the right destination."

Larry: "No matter how you slice it, it still adds up to other people's costs. How will you explain it to the Treasury? Didn't Henry Fowler ask: 'Why won't people stop, look and listen and count three before taking steps that will change the price-wage-profit mix'?"

Voice: "With all these European tourists coming here, higher rates will help our balance of payments."

Larry: "De Gaulle already sells stamps cheaper than we do. Americans are printing more magazines and advertising overseas, and using his post office."

Voice: "Why don't you line up the unions?"

Larry: "After you threatened to veto their pay hike if it exceeded 3.2 percent? Chief, are you disappointed in me?"

Voice: "I wouldn't put it that strongly, Larry. But maybe we ought to let McNamara carry the mail, too. He seems to have the answer to everything else."

At this point a messenger entered with a special delivery letter, and the conversation ended. The PMG read:

"Dear Larry:

"About those 6-cent stamps. We've got them—billions of them. In fact way too many for stockpile purposes.

"We'll probably have to dump them, at 5 cents each—if you raise postage rates to 6 cents.

"We'll be fighting inflation, and helping to keep our economy strong for the boys in Vietnam.

"Your customers.

"P.S.: Please ask Sheldon Cohen at Internal Revenue if it will be OK to write off our losses on the 6-cent stamps as a business expense. Or is it a public service contribution?

"P.P.S.: If you are designing a new 6-cent stamp, how about a picture of an aluminum smelter?"

Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, since the beginnings of our Republic, the people and their elected representatives in Congress have been engaged in a sort of ceremonial contest with the executive bureaucracy over the freedom of information issue. The dispute has, to date, failed to produce a practical result.

Government agencies and Federal officials have repeatedly refused to give individuals information to which they were entitled and the documentation of such unauthorized withholding—from the press, the public, and Congress—is voluminous. However, the continued recital of cases of secrecy will never determine the basic issue involved, for the point has already been more than proven. Any circumscription of the public's right to know cannot be arrived at by congressional committee compilations of instances of withholding, nor can it be fixed by Presidential fiat. At some point we must stop restating the problem, authorizing investigations, and holding hearings, and come to grips with the problem.

In a democracy, the public must be well informed if it is to intelligently exercise the franchise. Logically, there is little room for secrecy in a democracy. But, we must be realists as well as rationalists and recognize that certain government information must be protected and that the right of individual privacy must be respected. It is generally agreed that the public's knowledge of its government should be as complete as possible, consonant with the public interest and national security. The President by virtue of his constitutional powers in the fields of foreign affairs and national defense, without question, has some derived authority to keep secrets. But we cannot leave the determination of the answers to some arrogant or whimsical bureaucrat—they must be written into law.

To that end, I join other members of this House in introducing and supporting legislation to establish a Federal public records law and to permit court enforcement of the people's right to know.

The bill that I am introducing today would require every agency of the Federal Government to "make all its records promptly available to any person," and provides for court action to guarantee the right of access. The proposed law does, however, protect eight categories of sensitive Government information which would be exempted.

The protected categories are matters—

First, specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy;

Second, related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of any agency;

Third, specifically exempted from disclosure by statute;

Fourth, trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from the public and privileged or confidential;

Fifth, interagency or intra-agency memoranda or letters dealing solely with matters of law or policy;

Sixth, personnel and medical files and similar matters the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy;

Seventh, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement purposes except to the extent available by law to a private party; and

Eighth, contained in or related to examination, operating, or condition reports prepared by, on behalf of, or for the use of any agency responsible for the regulation or supervision of financial institutions.

The bill gives full recognition to the fact that the President must at times act in secret in the exercise of his constitutional duties when it exempts from availability to the public matters that are "specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy."

Thus, the bill takes into consideration the right to know of every citizen while affording the safeguards necessary to the effective functioning of government. The balances have too long been weighted in the direction of executive discretion and the need for clear guidelines is manifest. I am convinced that the answer lies in a clearly delineated and justiciable right to know.

A freedom of information bill passed the Senate in 1965 but the House has failed to act, perhaps because of opposition from the White House and other administration leaders in the executive branch. This legislation should be high on the priority list as the 2d session of the 89th Congress gets underway.

The 442d Veteran Tommy Kakesako Displays Old "Can Do" Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, clearly, great victories are not limited to those that are won on the battlefield—though it was on a battlefield in France that Tommy Kakesako's present victory had its start. Staff Sergeant Kakesako was wounded as he fought with his buddies in the 442d Combat Team to reach the lost Texas battalion in World War II. His wounds made him a Disabled American Veteran, and it is through the Hawaii Chapter of the DAV that former Sergeant Kagesako participated in his greatest battle in civilian life.

The fighters in this battle were disabled veterans who are now approaching middle age, not young able-bodied soldiers. They carried oil soaked torches—to burn and clear the land of hardy mangrove trees—instead of loaded rifles, and they manned bulldozers instead of tanks. The sacrifices they made were not of life or limb, but of sweat and toil. However, at stake was something as dear to their hearts as when they fought for their country. At stake was the long dreamed-of memorial to their departed war comrades at Keehi Lagoon in Honolulu, Hawaii.

The "battle" was not only fought in the field. Hundreds of hours were spent in organizing fund raising activities. Generous veterans donated time, money, and professional services for the cause. The long campaign for Tommy and his buddies lasted for 5 years and its victory was marked on Pearl Harbor Day in December 1965 by dedication ceremonies at Keehi Lagoon.

Everyone involved in this mammoth project agrees that it was Tommy Kakesako's untiring leadership that made the dream a reality. Kakesako, when asked by Managing Editor A. A. Smyser, of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, as to what had made him work so hard on the project, answered modestly and simply, in typical "Go for Broke" style, "There was a job to be done."

Mr. Speaker, as an old DAV "buddy" of Tommy I commend Tommy Kakesako for a great victory. And I should like to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article written by Editor A. A. Smyser on Tommy Kakesako and the DAV Memorial which appeared in the Saturday, December 11, 1965, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

Tommy's Memorial

(By A. A. Smyser)

The Disabled American Veterans Memorial that was dedicated on Pearl Harbor Day this week represented the work and contributions of hundreds of people, many of them World War II Purple Heart cases who gave up weekends to do volunteer manual labor.

This is the story of just one of them—the man who made the difference.

The memorial as it stands now includes an obelisk as tribute to the dead and a meeting hall and youth center for the use of the living.

S. Sgt. Tommy Kakesako was almost one of the dead. In a French forest more than 20 years ago he got his insides shot up as he and others of the 442d Infantry went to the rescue of the lost Texas battalion.

Tommy lived to come back and work as a jeweler with his brother in their shop on Alakea Street.

It was in 1960 that the local DAV chapter appointed Tommy as chairman of its committee to get the memorial built, a job he held until Alfred Los Banos, a paraplegic, took over last year. Tommy remains active as project coordinator.

The National DAV started the project in 1952. It conceived it as a static memorial to those who had died at sea.

Gov. Oren E. Long deeded 11 acres of land for the memorial to the Pacific War Memorial Commission and the commission in turn had assigned it to the DAV.

Ground was broken on December 7, 1952, and thereafter nothing happened.

Financial troubles caused the National DAV to call back the funds it had set aside for the Hawaii project and there finally began to be suggestions that Hawaii should revoke the 11 acres.

At this juncture, the local DAV decided to try to save the project on a do-it-yourself basis.

Pleas to the DAV national conventions in 1959 and 1960 resulted in a decision to turn the national rights over to the State chapter.

Someone was needed to head a committee to coordinate the project and Commander Edward Tamanaha reached out and picked Tommy Kakesako.

He had 11 acres of land to develop, almost no money, and a plan for a huge edifice of little or no utility.

The whole plan was restudied and the idea of a living memorial—something useful—evolved. It tied in neatly with the concept behind adjacent Keehi Lagoon Park that more recreation and park facilities are needed on the Kalihi side of town.

The new plan called for an obelisk, meeting houses, a rotunda and restaurant, a swimming pool, a marina, picnic and campsites, and parking facilities.

Even the first phase was estimated at $150,000 and assets were close to zero.

It was envisioned that $90,000 of this amount would be realized from a national sale of memorial medallions.

Evidence of the troubles that developed include the figure on medallion sales in a 1964 report—$3,414.

The medallion sales were only one of several disappointments. Local fundraising efforts were none too heartening either.

Tommy Kakesako had moments when the going looked black. But he always shook off his discouragement and plowed on, encouraging and praising the work of others.

"I personally feel we would have dropped the project if it hadn't been for Tommy," says William C. Oshiro, now Administrator of the Veterans' Administration in Hawaii.

Then 50 DAV members each pledged a minimum of $100 and that gave everyone heart.

A phone call to Morrison-Knudsen, contractors who were excavating the Lunalilo Freeway segment near Middle Street, brought something even more heartening—free fill for the area which was low, rough and not usable in its old form.

Morrison-Knudsen even' supplied free a bulldozer and operator (a DAV member) to shove the earth into place. The surface level has been raised 6 feet.

To clear mangrove trees on another part of the area, 50 DAV members volunteered their Saturdays and Sundays—and learned something about mangroves.

It took 5 months. The hardy mangroves resisted burning, finally yielded to oil-soaked junk rubber tires set ablaze at their base. Bill Beers, a retired Navy officer, won an award as "champion tire burner."

Members of the Kamehameha Lions Club also pitched in for 1 weekend of burning.

The National DAV made an initial contribution of $8,000 and the local chapter of $15,000.

Then a past national commander, Frank Buono, took a special interest in the project and tied it to the 10-percent increase in pensions for disabled veterans voted by Congress in 1964.

He urged all recipients of the pension to give their first month's increase to the Hawaii project. This brought in more than $20,000 additional . Last year the National DAV added another $20,000—raising total out-of-State gifts to $53,000.

The 1964 State legislature, well sprinkle with veterans, appropriated $50,000 for an access road and parking.

U.S. Senator Dan Inouye also made a special fund appeal.

Meantime, a constant factor in all the planning was Kakesako.

He worried, pleaded, cajoled, and wouldn't take no for an answer.

Experienced in neither fundraising nor project development, he kept plugging.

Cash receipts pushed over $100.000 but donations of materials and professional services—earth fill, architectural designs and the like—came to possibly $250,000.

The constant prodder, always planning, with his head always filled with thoughts on how to make the project succeed was Kakesako.

State Representative Howard Miyake has written a report that says the memorial would never have been ready for dedication Tuesday except for Kakesako.

Miyake puts it this way: "Like a symphony conductor, he played our individual talents to create harmony out of confusion, reality out of verbosity."

Mrs. Kakesako didn't see much of her husband but supported him fully in all the work.

"We got so involved," she exclaims. Sundays, Mrs. Kakesako and her mother would drive to the lagoon to watch the sweaty, dirty progress of a bunch of World War II Purple Heart cases.

Like her husband, Mrs. Kakesako stresses the role of other people in the project—"that lagoon has involved a lot of people, rich and poor, young and old."

But she confesses they did eat and sleep with the lagoon always at the center of things for 5 years.

Now that the first phase of the lagoon is finished, the DAV hopes other veterans organizations will join in, build some of the planned buildings and move their headquarters there.

Discussions on this are underway.

Plans will also have to be made to see the area used effectively as the youth center it is intended to be.

Five years work is only the preliminary.

When Tommy was asked this week why he plugged so hard and persistently, the dialog went like this:

Tommy. I guess you want me to say something corny.

Question. No, but why did you do it? Did you volunteer?

Tommy. No, I didn't volunteer. I was assigned.

Question. What made you work so hard at it?

Tommy. There was a job to be done.

Question. Is that all?

Tommy. That's all.

The 442nd's can-do approach to World War II led to a postwar movie, "Go for Broke" which has just been back on the rerun circuit.

The DAV memorial at Keehi Lagoon, built largely by veterans who were maimed and crippled themselves, stands as particular testimony that the "Go for Broke" spirit still lives—and a self-effacing ex-staff sergeant helped prove it.

No Second Best for U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the international situation today is the primary concern of this Congress. Our commitments in Vietnam, southeast Asia, in the Western Hemisphere, and in other areas of this vast world bring into sharp focus the problem of seapower. In the January 1966 issue of the Navy Magazine, Mr. Morgan L. Fitch, Jr., president of the Navy League of the United States, speaks words that Members would do well to read and ponder.

Mr. Fitch points out that we must modernize our Navy, maintain our carrier forces, reestablish our sealift capabilities and merchant marine, and proceed with the orderly nuclearization of our surface fleet. "Anything less," warns Mr. Fitch, "is at the peril of our country." His remarks follow:

No Second Best for U.S. Navy

Congressman L. Mendell Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said on Navy Day, 1965, in New Orleans:

"To paraphrase a great leader of the world, I did not assume the chairmanship of the House Armed Services Committee to preside over the liquidation and demise of American seapower and over naval supremacy. I do not propose to be a party to any program that will lead the United States to the position of being the second greatest seapower in the world."

However, the fact is that we have been slipping toward becoming something less than No. 1 in seapower. The lessons from the past, the teachings of the present, and the judgment for our future all seem to dictate that backsliding in seapower of the United States must be brought to a halt, if this country is to survive, much less enjoy anything like its present standard of living. It is time to say that the second-best equipment is not good enough, that commonality is not a substitute for capability, and that now is not the time to sacrifice proven weapon systems for hopeful devices. It is true that this may cost money, but this is nothing more than the sacrifice that President Kennedy warned about. These matters are nonpartisan and are of concern to all Americans.

PENNYWISE ECONOMIZING

Our past economizing in the Defense Establishment resulted in sacrifice of much of our sealift and an emasculated merchant marine. The prognostication that airlift would replace sealift would seem to be totally refuted as we now send about 98 percent of our supplies to Vietnam by ship. As a result, we scramble to make up for this folly and we buy foreign bottoms to sustain our efforts.

Our economizing in the Defense Department has resulted in much substandard housing for our servicemen and something less than the performance of essential maintenance on our bases. Now we are behind in adequate housing, and the current announcement of the Secretary of Defense that he is deferring the building of new military housing promises to put us further behind. We are trying to catch up on maintenance and indications are that essential maintenance will not be caught up.

Defense economizing has caused us to take something less than the best in the fossil-fueled aircraft carrier USS *John F. Kennedy*. Such economizing has resulted in only one carrier being laid down since 1961. Modernization of the fleet has been slowed, with the result that tired ships are required to keep new-ship operating schedules.

In order to beat the buck, we have sought to solve all airplane problems with the TFX, now dubbed the F–111. Latest reports indicate that this aircraft is flunking as a carrier aircraft. Now the TFX has been tagged as the hopeful, if not prayerful, replacement for the B–52, a proven airplane. All of this is great provided that we are not playing "Russian roulette".

Our ships are plying the seas on schedules hardly believable, and many of these ships which were aging, are now rapidly depreciating. We are approaching the point where the ships have to be replaced, if we are to maintain a Navy, the basis of seapower. Postponing this ship replacement cannot help but result in sacrifice of national defense.

TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE

While we fumble along, the Soviet Union has been building a modern merchant marine, a large submarine fleet, and modern ships of war. Our lessons on seapower seem to have been better learned elsewhere.

We have been fighting Vietnam with too little, too late, and the best assurance we can get is that we are not losing. But, at this writing, this is even doubtful. The worst of it is that even peace in Vietnam does not bring utopia to the world. Hopefully, we do not have to take on two Vietnams, but this is not assured. If we do fight elsewhere, during or after the Vietnam fracas, the percentages are awfully high that the burden will fall upon seapower, ergo the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps.

If we are to avoid the position of being the second greatest seapower in the world, we must modernize the Navy, including provision for at least standard housing; maintain our carrier forces; reestablish our sea lift capability and merchant marine, and proceed with orderly nucleariaztion of our surface fleet. Anything less is at the peril of our country.

Speech by Miss Kathleen Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JED JOHNSON, JR.
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to call attention of the Members of Congress of an outstanding speech by Miss Kathleen Kennedy, of Lawton, Okla., who won first place in the "Voice of Democracy" speech contest in Lawton recently. Miss Kennedy, a 15-year-old high school student, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Kennedy, 1119 Cherry Lawton, Okla. The contest was sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 1193 and VFW Auxiliary.

The speech, which won second prize in the State contest held at El Reno, follows, along with two articles from local newspapers:

Speech by Miss Kathleen Kennedy

On the 27th of January 1837, the tall figure of Abraham Lincoln gave these words to an audience in Springfield, Ill.: "This task, gratitude to our fathers, justice to ourselves, duty to posterity and love for our species, in general, all imperatively require us faithfully to perform."

Little did his audience realize that his words on democracy would be cherished by all freemen. It seems almost impossible to try to tackle a word like democracy and tell you just what it means to me. It is a broad and expansive word, it can take on many moods and colors.

There are two ways I think of democracy. First of all, I think what it has done in the past. I remember how it was interwoven with our proud heritage, and why men and women fought, died, and suffered for its principles.

Second, I think what democracy means to me today. This form of government affects my family, church, city, and, of course, the Nation as a whole.

Looking back we see that during the Revolutionary War, thousands of men died to simply establish our standards of government. Thousands more died during the Civil War to preserve our form of democracy. During the two world wars, thousands of men died to protect our already established and preserved way of life.

Daniel Webster did not give his life to his country, but he expressed his feelings in these words: "Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless. No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffer or if he fall in defense of the liberties and Constitution of his country."

This man was *risking his career, his political popularity, and his friends* because of an idea or ideas he believed in so strongly. But as a student I don't hold the position of Lincoln, Webster, Jefferson, or Washington, nor do I have the influence that our Senators and Representatives do. But by being a student I have found a unique parallel with my school, and my country for the academic freedom that we are allowed is the gift of democracy in action.

I find that with student government our school operates on somewhat the same principles as our country. Because the students are mature a high school moves and grows with its surroundings. And by being a student with interest and concern for my school, I find that at the same time I am working also for my country, the United States. Casual, friendly, sometimes heated discussions on government policies, religion, and politics are frequent with classmates.

Many adults have the vision of students going to school and doing nothing but studying dry facts from a textbook and then coming home to watch a television program. In many ways this is an inaccurate description. Students in high school realize that much too soon they will be deciding a career for life. Consequently adult interests and ideas are cultivated.

Adolescent interests and fads boost the American economy several million dollars each year. We realize that these are temporary and our real, deep interests lie with current events. Why? Simply because we are the generation to come, the leaders, movers, the ones to carry the torch.

With democracy in our school we find an atmosphere of concern for each other and interest in our future. For just as our defense and preservation of democracy were important in the past, we must continue to recognize the value of democracy in everyday life in order to offer a proud heritage for the future.

[From the Lawton (Okla.) Constitution, Jan. 6, 1966]

Lawton High School Girl First in Speech Contest

Kathleen Kennedy, a 15-year-old Lawton High School student, has won first place in the "Voice of Democracy" speech contest.

The Wednesday night contest was sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post No. 1193 and VFW auxiliary.

Other winners in the 19th annual competition were Kade McClure, 15, Eisenhower High School, second; Glen Huff, 16, Lawton High School, third, and Bill Baker, 17, St. Mary's High School, fourth.

Miss Kennedy received a plaque and a $25 savings bond; McClure received a plaque and a check for $15; Huff received a check for $10, and Baker was awarded a plaque.

The winners were picked from 18 contestants by the judges, Jim Williams, KCO Radio; Gary Smith, KSWO Radio; Mrs. Evelyn Evans, speech instructor at Cameron College, and Eugene Pate, speech instructor at Cameron.

Topic for the contest was "Democracy: What It Means to Me." The same topic is used nationally.

Miss Kennedy, McClure and Baker will record their speeches for entry in the State contest scheduled at El Reno at 7 p.m. Friday. Mrs. Deward Stringer, of the VFW auxiliary and a cochairman of the contest committee, will take the tapes to El Reno.

Alton Langford, VFW post commander, served with Mrs. Stringer.

First prize in the State contest will be a $100 bond, a plaque, and the opportunity to enter the taped script in a national contest. Second will be a $50 bond and third a $25 bond.

Miss Kennedy is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Kennedy, 1119 Cherry; Baker is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Bert Baker, 1315 South 26th Place; Huff the son of Mr. and Mrs. J. E. Huff, 925 Oak, and McClure, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Kinley McClure, No. 12 South 45th.

The students were accompanied to the contest by their speech teachers, Mrs. Pearson Porter, Eisenhower; Mrs. Stanley Brown, St. Mary's, and Carl L. McClure, Lawton High.

[From the Lawton (Okla.) Constitution-Morning Press, Jan. 9, 1966]

Lawton High School Sophomore Second in Contest

Kathleen Kennedy, a sophomore at Lawton High School, placed second in the State Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest Friday in El Reno.

First place went to Bob Nicholas, a Muskogee senior. The contest is jointly sponsored by the VFW and auxiliary.

Winning third was Andy Hale, a Duncan junior.

Miss Kennedy will receive a $50 savings bond. First prize won by Nichols was a 5-day expense paid trip to Washington, a $100 bond and a plaque. Hale received a $25 bond.

Contest topic was "Democracy: What it means to me." Nicholas' script will be entered in a national contest in competition for scholarships totaling $13,500.

A total of 22 Oklahoma high schools entered the contest.

Miss Kennedy, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Kennedy, 1119 Cherry, was sponsored by Lawton VFW Post No. 1193 and auxiliary.

Bill Baker, a student at Lawton St. Mary's High School and Kade McClure of Eisenhower High School, also participated in the contest.

Mrs. Deward Stringer, president of the local auxiliary and contest cochairman for the local unit, and Mrs. Albert Hawkins attended the contest.

Fiscal Policy Outlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. HANSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, much has been said concerning the state of the Union message of the President. One of the most incisive comments appeared on the editorial page of the Des Moines Sunday Register, January 16. In this editorial, President Johnson is recognized for his fiscal responsibility, not only for his proposals for the 1967 budget, but for the commendable way in which he has performed a very difficult task in the past 2 years.

It is my sincere conviction that the prudent programs proposed by the President coupled with continued fiscally responsible proposals will meet with favor in Congress.

I would like to share the thoughts expressed in this editorial with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

FISCAL POLICY OUTLINES

When President Johnson sends his budget message to Congress in the near future the administration's economic policy for the next fiscal year will be spelled out in more detail. But the state of the Union message gave the outlines. The proposed target is a balanced cash budget—or possibly a slight surplus.

The cash budget reflects the total income and outgo of the Federal Government, including not only ordinary Government spending and tax receipts but also the operations of the trust funds, of which the giant social security system is the most important.

The status of the cash budget measures the impact on total demand of the Federal Government. If the Government is pushing into the economy more money than it is extracting from the economy—as it has been doing in the last several years—the effect is to expand total demand and stimulate business activity and higher prices. If the Government draws more money from the public than it spends, then the effect is restrictionist and tends to curb price rises.

During the last few years it has been possible to operate an "inflationary" Government fiscal policy without actually causing price inflation. This was possible because the extra demand created by the Government drew more human and material resources into production, so that the rise in supply offset the increased demand.

Now, however, the economy is running almost at capacity. There is very little slack in the supply of skilled labor and plant capacity to meet an extra surge of demand from Government purchases. So the wise fiscal policy for the National Government now is to lower the steam of the Federal fiscal operation on the private economy. That is the meaning of President Johnson's budget proposals, outlined in the state of the Union message.

The President is proposing an increase in taxes amounting to about $5 billion for the next fiscal year. This would about take care of the increase in military spending he is calling for to meet the requirements of the Vietnam war. The extra tax money would come from more nearly current income tax payments, both personal and corporate, and from a delay in effectiveness of scheduled excise tax cuts.

Of course, the bulge in income tax payments would be only temporary. The extra tax receipts from this source could not be enough to balance the budget, but the administration is counting on a continuation of the rise in total output. Most Government and private economists are expecting a growth in the gross national product from $672 billion in 1965 to around $715 or $720 billion in 1966. This would result in a considerable gain in Government revenue without any tax changes.

A number of things could go wrong to upset this fiscal plan. Congress might not agree on the tax changes, and it might not agree on the spending plans. Any increase in spending, especially for military purposes, beyond the President's proposals would increase the danger of inflation. Military spending is particularly inflationary, since the money paid out to civilian workers and business is not offset by an increase in supply of goods and services for civilian use.

The President's first statement on fiscal policy sets forth a prudent program for the next year. Inflationary pressure is moderate now. But if Congress decides not to go along with the tax proposals, some cuts in spending will be necessary if price stability with continued economic growth are to be achieved. And if inflation pressures increase, it might be necessary to over-balance the budget instead of just balancing it.

Dr. Robert C. Weaver: An Excellent Choice for the Cabinet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERT BANDSTRA

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my agreement with the views expressed Sunday by the Washington Post in an editorial regarding the appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Good appointments are good politics. An appointment should neither be made nor withheld on the basis of race, religion, or color since these factors are after all irrelevant under our system. The editorial carefully points this out. But what is important is that Dr. Weaver has proven his ability in the area of housing and urban affairs and for this reason the overwhelming majority of Americans approve of President Johnson's appointment.

The job of heading the new Department of Housing and Urban Development will not be an easy task. But that is all the more reason why the post should go to a man with Dr. Weaver's talent and experience.

The editorial from the Washington Post follows:

SECRETARY WEAVER

In appointing Dr. Robert Clifton Weaver, to serve as the first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, President Johnson chose the best available man for a difficult post. A pioneer in public housing whose experience goes back to the early days of the New Deal, Dr. Weaver served with distinction as the rent administrator in New York City, housing commissioner for the State of New York, and finally as the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The fact that Dr. Weaver is the great-grandson of a slave will irk those whose prejudices are blinding where men of color, no matter how talented, are concerned. And it will by the same token enlist the equally biased support of those who hold that the new cabinet post should have gone to a Negro irrespective of his capabilities. Fair-minded Americans applaud the appointment of a great authority on urban affairs and housing who happens to be a Negro. And they are equally delighted by the appointment of Robert C. Wood as Under Secretary. Dr. Wood, a native of Florida and professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has gained an enviable reputation in the field of urban affairs at the age of 42.

After describing the problems with which the new Department will be confronted, President Johnson turned to Dr. Weaver and said, "May the good Lord have mercy on you." The new Secretary's legion of admirers share that sentiment, and have confidence in his ability to build an effective Department.

The Cotton Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marvin Caldwell is the editor of the Marianna, Ark., Courier Index, which serves Lee County and a great portion of the eastern Arkansas cotton belt. Mr. Caldwell is a most perceptive publisher and is quite knowledgeable on cotton and the economics of our agricultural community.

Cotton farmers are making decisions at this time with respect to the diversion provisions of the new law.

For this reason, his signed article, carried in the January 13 issue of the Courier Index and his editorial in the same issue, will be of great interest to all who are now concerned with the implementation and operation of the new cotton provisions contained in Public Law 89–321 enacted at the first session of the 89th Congress.

Because of their value to such a study, it is a pleasure to call this article and editorial to the attention of the Congress:

[From the Marianna (Ark.) Courier Index, Jan. 13, 1966]

FARMERS FACE A DILEMMA IN NEW COTTON PROGRAM

(By Marvin Caldwell)

The cotton farmer has a problem. Perhaps we should say, he has a new problem.

Four choices are open to the farmer and most of them are still scratching their heads in an effort to select the best and most profitable path to follow. And it doesn't necessarily follow that best will also be most profitable for there are many considerations that will go into a farmer's choice of plans. They include such factors as equipment, labor supply, technical know-how, and so forth.

The Government offers the cotton farmer four choices this year and a decision must be made by March 1. The first choice is "nonparticipation."

Under this plan, the farmer can plant 100 percent of his cotton allotment but must sell the cotton at 90 percent of the world market price which is 21 cents for middling inch. This does not involve wide-open planting of cotton. The farmer must still stay within his farm acreage allotment which is the same as 1965. Most observers agree that we are not ready for 21-cent cotton.

Plans 2, 3, and 4 involve diversion of cotton land to nonproduction with the Government increasing the support price in relation to the amount of cotton land taken out of production. The only crops that can be planted on diverted land and sold are sunflower, castor beans, safflower, guar and sesame. There is almost no market for any of these products. The land may be pastured November 30 to March 1.

Farmers can divert 12½ percent, 25 percent, or 35 percent and by a formula, the Government will make up the difference. The whole idea is that we are producing 35 percent too much cotton so the farmer is being encouraged to cut his acreage by 35 percent.

A farmer must reduce his cotton acreage by at least 12½ percent to qualify as a cooperator. This is further complicated by the small farmer clause which does not require a farm with less than 10 acres of cotton (or projected yield of 3,600 pounds or less) to reduce his acreage.

County Agent J. O. Hill has calculated the difference in the four plans for an average operation of 100 acres with a projected yield of 650 pounds of lint cotton per acre. According to his figures there is so little difference in the three diversion plans that money will not be the consideration when a farmer makes his choice. On a gross profit basis, nonparticipation is not practical. However, other considerations just might send some farmers along this path.

Our sample farm would bring in $7,150 gross profit if the entire 100 acre allotment were planted. The gross profit (when 12½ percent is diverted) would be $10,718.05; for 25 percent diversion it would be $10,611; for 35 percent diversion it would be $10,529. These figures do not take into account cost of machinery and land, depreciation, rent, et cetera.

It is obvious that diversion is the best plan for most farmers. It is also obvious that the choice most farmers will make will be determined by factors other than gross profit—for that will remain about the same no matter which diversion plan he follows. He may lose his labor if too much land is diverted. The machines he has purchased will depreciate just about as fast as they wear out so there is a limit to how much he can reduce his cotton acreage and still maintain an efficient operation.

Each farm is a different operation and each farmer has different problems and different considerations that will dictate the course of action he follows. He will not know for sure if he has followed the right course until next fall.

One farmer has decided that this whole plan was devised by a computor and there is not much hope for the farmer with a pencil trying to outsmart an economist with a computor. He may be right.

[From the Marianna (Ark.) Courier Index, Jan. 13, 1966]

The Cotton Program

The new cotton program may solve the problem of oversupply but it is certainly creating new problems in the Cotton Belt. And before proceeding, let it be known that we are not convinced it will go very far toward solving anything.

The new problem is the depressing economic effect that the program will have on every area that produces cotton. The farmer may or may not come out as well financially. This is open to debate. But it is a dead letter cinch that the program is going to hurt everyone else in the community.

Almost every farmer, for his own protection, is going to plant from 12½ to 35 percent less cotton this year. This is going to mean that he will use less labor, less seed, less fertilizer, less everything. Our economy is based on the farmer (with some notable exceptions). When the farmer is spending less, all of us will suffer the consequences. This includes the day laborer who did not finish the second grade as well as the business and professional man in downtown Mariana.

The Government is spending billions of dollars—a great deal of it right here in Lee County—to stamp out poverty. They will have to pump a lot more into Lee County to offset the adverse effect of this program on the economy of our community.

Forty-eighth Anniversary of the Independence of Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROLLAND REDLIN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. REDLIN. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, January 23, celebrations will be held in my State of North Dakota and throughout the Nation in observance of the 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine. Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, Steele, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., has written me a letter outlining the courageous struggle of the Ukrainian people for freedom and independence. Under unanimous consent I request that Dr. Zukowsky's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., STATE BRANCH
OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Steele, N. Dak., January 15, 1966.

Hon. ROLLAND REDLIN,
Member of Congress, U.S. House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REDLIN: We want to call your attention again that in the month of January Ukranians all over the world including our State, will mark the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine, which took place on the 22d of January in Kiev, the capital of Ukraine, also the 47th anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22, 1919, whereby western Ukraine united with the National Ukrainian Republic into one sovereign and independent Republic of the Ukrainian people.

Although the Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of States, including the Government of Soviet Russia, it had no durable peace nor prosperity because Communist Russia invaded the Ukrainian state despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainian independence.

For nearly 3½ years, without assistance from the Western World, the Ukrainian people waged a heroic war against Communist Russia in the defense of sovereignty of their country but the gallant struggle came to a bitter and tragic end. The free Ukrainian state was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic.

Since then the Russian Communist enslavement with brutal oppression and domination has caused much suffering among these people. But despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination and are continuing to struggle for freedom and national independence. Through a series of heroic and bloody uprisings and a steady resistance through underground warfare the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their undying love of freedom and their opposition to alien slavery and oppression.

Both the Congress and the President of the United States have recognised the legitimate right to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the "Captive Nations Week Resolution" in July of 1959, which enumerated the Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and is entitled to recognition and moral support by the American people and the free world at large. During the debates on colonialism in the United Nations Assembly in 1960 and 1961 a number of western statesmen, including our Ambassador raised their voices in protest against the persecution of the Ukrainian people by the Communists.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire since the Communist menace has spread into Asia, our shores in Cuba and Latin America, it has become a political necessity for the free world to recognize that an independent Ukraine would substantially weaken the Communist empire.

Americans of the Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 48th anniversary of the independence of Ukraine on Sunday, January 23, 1966, in a solemn and fitting manner with special religious services and programs which will be heard on radio and TV over stations in Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, and Dickinson. We firmly believe that you are aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism.

This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Congress and the American people but also for the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspiration of the Ukrainian people.

This may also provide an opportunity for better understanding by extending diplomatic relations to Ukraine which is a charter member of the United Nations, and by nominating an American of the Ukrainian descent to serve on some diplomatic post and by the issuance of a commemorative stamp to Europe's freedom fighter and Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko.

Sincerely yours,
DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.

Six-Day Postal Service Reinstated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to note that last weekend President Lyndon Johnson restored parcel post and postal window service on Saturdays. This action was taken by the

President despite the many fiscal economy measures for which the President is well noted. I believe the President acted wisely and I believe that every citizen who uses the postal service will praise the President for these wise actions. The vast amount of mail which the Department now carries and which we have every reason to expect will increase greatly over the years, can only be carried efficiently by expanding the services of the Postal Department. I believe the President and Postmaster General O'Brien both recognize this very thoroughly. This is, I am sure, why they acted to reinstate these valuable services.

Economy cannot be practiced in the true sense of the word by decreasing services performed of such a vital nature. We all know that very many people who use the postal money order only have access to the post office conveniently on Saturdays. I am sure many people across the country are praising President Johnson for this action.

Two-Year Terms, or Three or Four?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it is quite interesting to follow the columnists in connection with their comments on the state of the Union message. One of the most interesting, I think, was by James J. Kilpatrick, published in the Evening Star of January 18, entitled "Two-Year Terms, or Three or Four?" His column follows:

TWO-YEAR TERMS, OR THREE OR FOUR?

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

In the course of asking Congress the other night for the sun, the moon, the stars, and an end to yellow fever, our "peerless leader" asked also for a resolution proposing one more amendment to the Constitution. He believes that Members of the House of Representatives should have terms of 4 years, commencing with the elections of 1972.

This is the second amendment President Johnson has requested. Thus far, the Congress has shown little interest in his first proposal, which had to do with making the electoral college even more anonymous than it already is. Members of the House of Representatives, who regard themselves as second-class citizens, are certain to pursue his 4-year plan with vast enthusiasm. Senators, we may surmise, will restrain their joy.

The Senate historically has been cool to the idea of 4-year terms in the other body, for obvious political reasons. Such an arrangement would make it possible for politically ambitious Representatives to hold onto their House seats while running for the Senate. Senators BAYH and ERVIN, to mention only a couple of well-known figures, come up for election in 1968; God and the voters willing, they would come up again in 1974. But if the Johnson amendment had been ratified, Members of the House from Indiana and North Carolina, without the slightest risk to their own 4-year seats, could then make a fearful nuisance of themselves.

"Nothing is so hateful to the politician," Virginia's BILL TUCK once remarked, "as the awful prospect of opposition." The maxim will not be lost on Messrs. BAYH and ERVIN, who wield formidable influence on the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Political considerations to one side, does the 4-year plan have merit? Conservatives will answer, not much.

Johnson made the familiar case for his proposal. "The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and wisdom. Today, too, the work of government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life."

The Founding Fathers considered most of these same arguments long ago. The subject arose at the Philadelphia Convention on June 12, 1787. Roger Sherman of Connecticut wanted to limit Members of the House to 1-year terms. John Rutledge of South Carolina urged 2-year terms. James Madison of Virginia held out for 3-year terms; he thought this would "give the Government stability and induce gentlemen of the first weight to engage in it." But Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts was afraid that 3-year terms would "alarm the people, as savoring of despotism."

Temporarily, Madison's 3-year proposal was adopted. On June 21, however, the word "three" was expunged on the motion of Virginia's Governor Randolph, and the word "two" substituted. Sherman was still urging annual elections, lest Members of the House stay away so long they forgot their constituents. Alexander Hamilton preferred the 3-year plan, largely because of an argument advanced by Johnson. He felt that 3-year terms would encourage superior men to run for seats in the House.

In the end, of course, the 2-year term was agreed to. The following February of 1788, when they published Federalist 52 and 53, Madison and Hamilton defended the arrangement. They weren't as enthusiastic about short terms as Thomas Jefferson, who all his life clung to the view that "short elections will keep Congress right." But if they couldn't get terms of 3 years, they were ready to settle for 2; they never asked 4.

The old principles still apply, despite Johnson's valid point on the increasing complexity of legislation.

But nothing will come of all this until two-thirds of the Senators and three-fourths of the States agree to a change. Don't hold your breath.

An Action Program for Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to a report made by the Full Employment Steering Committee of the Democratic Study Group. This committee, composed of a group of freshmen Members of Congress, with myself as chairman and Mr. REUSS as adviser, includes Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WILLIAM FORD, Mr. GILLIGAN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HICKS, Mr. IRWIN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KREBS, and Mr. SCHISLER. While all these members concur with the basic approach of the report, not all of them agree with every one of the specific observations or proposals it contains, other than the employment program, in which they all concur.

The committee proposes the establishment of a program which would eventually provide perhaps 1 million "hard core" unemployed with basic education, training, and publicly financed employment in subprofessional jobs. These jobs would be in the nature of aids to doctors, nurses, laboratory personnel, and orderlies in hospitals, as assistants to home nurses and physical and occupational therapists, as helpers in libraries and assistants to teachers and administrative staff in schools, as museum aids and playground and recreation assistants, and as assistants to probation officers and those fighting crime and delinquency.

Further subprofessional aids could be employed to improve the beauty of our Nation by working on highway maintenance, waterfront cleanup, park construction as well as maintenance and groundskeeping. Urban life could be further improved by provision of aids to building inspectors, public health officials, sanitation officials, and water and air pollution control personnel.

The key goals of the program are:

First. Providing vitally needed assistance to the health care and educational institutions of our country which are at present sorely understaffed with professionals, many of whom must spend valuable time in tasks which could be performed by aids.

In the light of current programs for expansion of medical services and educational facilities, our health and education professionals will be in increasingly short supply in the future. These aids, by adding to our effective labor supply in urgently needed job categories, are a basic necessity now that rising demands of the war in Vietnam threaten to create inflationary pressures which will be aggravated in the months ahead by an increasingly tight labor market.

Second. Strengthening the system of voluntary health institutions which must rely in large part on the efforts of voluntary fundraising and volunteer services to supplement their incomes in order to meet their personnel and financial needs. The use of aids for whose salaries the local institutions will be reimbursed by the Federal Government, will not only permit the provision of better medical services by these institutions but will also reduce the fundraising burden of civic leaders.

Third. Lessening the drain on welfare and other supportive community services by providing a halfway house or way station for those who have never been a part of the employment pool and who, through the program, will for the first time find their way into the labor force.

Fourth. Recognizing that in 1966 jobs are at the heart of the civil rights struggle. The main lesson gained from the experience of the past year, particularly in recent months during which unrest has given vent to violence and near violence in urban centers throughout the country, is that the vital need for jobs lies at the heart of the despair, bitterness, and frustration breeding such explosions.

Investigators seeking the cause and prevention of Watts and similar destructive outbursts have universally reported the eagerness on the part of the poverty stricken to be gainfully employed. Efforts to convert the heretofore "untouchables" of our society into gainfully employed members of the labor force not only will enhance their status as human beings who can have pride in themselves as people but will also give them satisfaction that they are providing critically needed services for their communities and their country.

I would also like to call attention of the House to the perceptive and thoughtful editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on January 9, 1966. The editorial and the report follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 9, 1966]

Training for Stability

The news that the unemployment rate fell to 4.1 percent in December underscores the relevance of a proposal made by the Democratic Study Group for providing 1 million of the hard-core unemployed with basic education and vocational training. There were nearly 2.9 million Americans without jobs in December. If the present economic expansion is to continue without creating additional inflationary pressures, a way must be found to add them and other disadvantaged people who will shortly enter the labor force to the ranks of the gainfully employed.

The Democratic Study Group report, prepared under the able chairmanship of Representative James H. Scheuer, of New York, envisions a public employment training program in which the unemployed would provide needed services in the fields of health, education, and urban improvement. Since the wages paid for such jobs would be at the low end of the wage scale, there would be a strong incentive for the better workers in the program to move into private industry.

This proposal effects a marriage between the need for more subprofessional service workers and the desirability of training those who tend to be disqualified for employment because of poor education. But it would better satisfy the demands of an economy that may soon be confronted with tight labor markets if the public employment program were tied to a parallel effort by private industry.

As the rate of employment falls below 4 percent of the labor force, private employers are going to encounter difficulties in filling positions on the lower rungs of the skill ladder. This squeeze on the supply side of the labor market might be eased by a cooperative arrangement under which the Government provides basic education in a public service-training program and private industry completes the task of selecting candidates for their own job-training programs.

Tight labor markets, as experience suggests, are the best antidotes to hard-core unemployment. But they are likely to intensify inflationary pressures unless steps are taken to augment the supply of basically educated labor. A program such as that suggested by Mr. Scheuer's group, coordinated with the efforts of private industry, would smooth the transition to a higher level of national employment.

An Action Program for Full Employment

(Issued January 6, 1966, by the Democratic Study Group Full Employment Steering Committee, Congressman James H. Scheuer, chairman)

Twenty years ago Congress declared "* * * that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to create and maintain conditions which afford employment opportunities * * * for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." (Public Law 304, 79th Cong., Feb. 20, 1946, sec. 2.) This commitment to full employment and stable, noninflationary economic growth has been described by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress: "Full employment of labor and capital is a moving target; the labor force grows continuously; workers are released by laborsaving machinery and new techniques; new investment increases the capacity of farms and factories. Thus, total demand must expand rapidly just to keep from falling behind rising potential output." (Report of the Joint Economic Committee, March 1964.)

Federal policies carried out, in cooperation with "* * * industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, * * *" have been successful in avoiding a deep, prolonged postwar depression such as followed World War I and earlier conflicts. But in terms of achieving and maintaining full employment, the record is not good. In only 3 out of 20 years has unemployment averaged about 3 percent, and in only 5 out of 20 years has it been 4 percent or less. For the entire 20 years unemployment has averaged about 4.9 percent and for the last 5 years 5.6 percent. The latest figure is still slightly over 4 percent with a nonwhite male teenage unemployment rate of about 25 percent.

The Kennedy-Johnson administrations have had an interim target of 4 percent unemployment. This is a third above the 3 percent generally viewed as the acceptable long-term goal. It is far above the rates of 2 percent or less achieved during the post-World War II era in such other countries as Britain, France, Sweden, Japan, and Germany. With the interim target of 4 percent now in view, we should now begin to prepare for early achievement of an unemployment rate of 3 percent.

The setting of this 3-percent goal is no mere exercise in statistical definitions or abstract political philosophy. It is a vital necessity if we are to assure maximum efficiency in the use of our human resources—opening avenues for millions to escape poverty and overcome racial and social barriers to full participation in our society.

For our Negro citizens, disproportionately high unemployment and lack of opportunity for advancement to better paying jobs are basic reasons for their frustration and resentment. The high overall unemployment rates of recent years have also meant limited opportunities for young people seeking a start in the labor market. Their unemployment rate has been double or triple the national average, creating a dangerously discouraging atmosphere for the Nations most precious resource—its youth.

An unemployment rate of 3 percent or less continuously maintained over the years will open wide the doors of employment opportunity to Negroes. It will make it possible to hold unemployment among our youth to a minimum, providing maximum inducement for them to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to make their optimal contribution to our economy. Eliminating the hopelessness, disillusionment, and bitterness that is generated by high unemployment should do much to hold down crime rates, reduce delinquency, and direct energies in more constructive channels.

ACHIEVING FULL EMPLOYMENT

To achieve 3 percent unemployment in the next year or two we shall have to create over three-quarters of a million additional jobs and will have to produce a gross national product of over $900 billion by 1970.

In 1965, the gross national product will total about $670 billion with unemployment averaging about 4½ percent of the labor force. The Council of Economic Advisers has estimated that—at its 4 percent interim goal, now almost achieved—the economy in 1970 would produce about $895 billion of gross national product. We believe it is imperative that the Nation aim for a more defensible and healthy long-term goal of 3 percent. Even this figure would be well above that which has been achieved in a number of other industrial countries where 2 percent and below are the accepted rates of unemployment. At this level, in 1970, the economy would produce about $10–$15 billion more of GNP per year. At this level, the economy would create over 1.3 million new jobs per year to absorb the expected increase in the labor force as a result of the increasing population of working age, and at least 2 million new jobs per year to take the place of those eliminated by technological progress—a total of over 3½ million new jobs per year.[1]

If we were to average 3-percent unemployment rather than 4 percent between now and 1980 we would have to create about 1 million additional jobs; if we are to do it within the next year or two, as we should, we would have to add over three-quarters of a million additional jobs. We believe this is entirely possible and should be an immediate goal of public and private economic policies. This implies an economy which can support almost 81 million civilian jobs by 1970 and almost 96 million civilian jobs by 1980.

In setting these dimensions for the economic opportunities of a full-employment economy, we recognize that they are but informed estimates. But practical men cannot wait until 1980 to find out what their targets should be and we believe the estimates are sufficiently accurate for guiding thinking about how to achieve full employment in a year or two, and to maintain a vigorous economy. What is needed is an action program with a balanced combination of Government monetary and fiscal policies combined with improved public and private policies concerning wages, prices, and employment.

MONETARY POLICY

Monetary ease accompanied by relatively low interest rates is essential to a full-employment policy. Ready availability of credit alone cannot get us to full employment but tight money can make it impossible.

Achieving and maintaining stability in a growing economy requires that total demand of consumers, business, and Government should be equal to total output at full employment and that total demand and total supply should increase at the same rate from year to year. This is possible only if money and credit are continually available at reasonable rates of interest.

Although ready availability of funds at low interest rates will not cause business investment or expansion if demand is inadequate and profit expectations poor, more sanguine business expectations will fail to produce and maintain full employment if financial markets are tight and interest rates relatively high. Home building will be slowed if prospective purchasers find financing difficult and rates excessive. Small businesses, which are the first to be refused credit, must restrict output, employment, and new investment. State and local governments also find that financing of needed public facilities becomes more difficult or even impossible.

The financial system of the United States is so complex that it is easy to lose sight of the most important fact about monetary policy: it cannot guarantee full employment but it can either prevent it or facilitate it. Therefore, monetary policy must be coordinated with other policies if we are to re-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

spond adequately to unemployment, balance-of-payments problems and inflationary pressures.

A prime example is the recent action of the Federal Reserve Board who by raising the discount rate to 4½ percent, the highest level in 35 years, may impede our advance toward full employment and a sustained full-employment growth rate. This dramatically illustrates the need for coordination of monetary policy with fiscal policy. Therefore, we recommend that the President initiate whatever action is necessary to assure this policy coordination in order to guarantee the ready availability of credit so necessary to sustain high rates of economic growth.

FISCAL POLICY

Federal fiscal policies should contribute to achieving and maintaining full employment without inflation. Given the support of appropriate monetary policies, they can largely assure success.

The Federal Government's expenditures and tax policies affect every individual, business, and State and local government units. Only within the past 2 years have we begun to use these fiscal tools effectively to reduce unemployment. We have yet to demonstrate our willingness to use them to achieve and maintain full employment without inflation. In this case, the main task of fiscal policy is to stimulate the economy, either through expenditures or tax reduction, to grow rapidly enough to reduce existing unemployment and to absorb rising productivity and a growing labor force. This can be made more difficult by a number of considerations. A prime example is the problem of adjusting policies in the light of the possible inflationary impact of rising defense spending generated by the war in Vietnam. Another problem arises because with our progressive tax structure, as GNP grows, tax revenues grow even faster, thus tending to retard economic growth short of full employment. The first case may require reduction in non-defense spending and/or increased taxes. The second case would call for a reduction in taxes and/or increased public expenditures sufficiently large so as to stimulate growth and offset the fiscal drag. From this, it can be seen that fiscal policy involves carefully balancing Federal tax and expenditure policies. The essential question is one involving allocation of resources. Thus when stimulation is needed, fiscal policy should be based on expenditures when the social benefits from these expenditures in areas such as education, health, urban development and transportation exceed the social benefits from additional resources devoted to private expenditures.[2] The same question of priorities applies when fiscal policy is used to slow down an overheated economy.

Tax reduction and reform are essential ingredients in a full employment program which will contribute to the elimination of poverty.

The Federal tax system is made up of a complex of levies, some falling on individual and corporate incomes, and others on specific transactions. In general, as the economy grows, the ratio of Federal revenues to the gross national product tends to rise. At the present time, the addition to Federal revenues is about $7 billion per year. Since expenditures are not necessarily related to the growth in gross national product, Federal revenues tend to rise faster than Federal expenditures leading to fiscal drag.

These features carry two implications for a full employment policy. First, the Federal tax system is the Nation's most powerful automatic stabilizer since any reduction in incomes or expenditures immediately results in a more than proportionate fall in Federal revenues. To maintain stability therefore it is important that the progressivity of the Federal tax system be maintained or increased, particularly since the State and local tax systems have very little cyclical flexibility.

Second, a Federal tax structure that provides a maximum of automatic stabilizing action will, at the same time, provide a maximum of fiscal drag if left alone for extensive periods of time. The amount by which Federal revenues increase will go up from year to year as the economy grows, creating larger and larger withdrawals of funds which may not necessarily be offset by increases in expenditures.

The Federal tax structure, therefore, can stabilize the economy at persistently high unemployment rates and, indeed, there are reasonable grounds to suspect that this is what happened in the late 1950's and early 1960's. Persistent and steady expansion of the economy toward full employment over the last several years is clearly related to the efforts of the Kennedy-Johnson administrations to reduce the drag of the Federal budget on private economic activity.

Another feature of the Federal tax system is the large number or loopholes or special exemptions and exemptions which are incorporated in the tax code and relieve certain forms of income—or portions of income—from taxation. These special features erode the tax base, resulting in higher rates on the remainder of taxable income. Serious attention should be given to correcting these inequities.

Finally, we must recognize that over the years ahead we shall have to face the problems created by the immense productivity of the Federal tax system as a generator of revenue while, at the same time, State and local governments struggle desperately to make their tax sources provide the revenue for skyrocketing social needs, especially in our growing metropolitan areas. Some way must be found to use the broad, general, nationally applicable Federal tax system as a means of solving some of the mounting problems of State and local governments.

We urge that our colleagues in deciding the form this program should take will assure that it meets at least the minimum criteria of diverting a portion of the increased revenues to aid the State and local governments in financing the public facilities and services—a task which they are finding increasingly difficult to do in an equitable manner.

PROVIDING A MINIMUM INCOME

The time has come when we must begin to provide a minimum income for everyone.

Although we cannot hope to return to the early American frontier society of individual independent family farmers, we can re-create in our modern industrial urban environment the economic conditions for that cherished independence and individualism. We can assure everyone an adequate minimum income.

Indeed, we now provide this after a fashion in a variety of programs that are too often subject to the indignities of a means test. Too often, it is also the case that these programs, hampered by inadequate funds and staff, perpetuate dependency and poverty rather than provide the means and motivation to break the cycle.

This goal could be implemented in two ways. First a floor could be provided through a negative tax on income. A scheme which could make an important contribution to the assurance of a living income can easily be devised. Second, our social insurance programs (OASDI, unemployment insurance, workman's compensation, etc.) could be improved and geared to provide a floor under individual and family incomes.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE DECISIONS

Decisions on government expenditures should take into consideration their consequences for stability and growth in our economy and their contribution to the elimination of poverty and the realization of opportunity for all.

Public expenditures—Federal, State, and local—must meet the test first of all that they provide services which individuals and private organizations cannot provide, or cannot provide efficiently and reliably. In addition, it is a first principle of sound programing of public expenditures that they should be as stable, predictable, and as closely geared to long-term needs as is feasible. Attempts to turn government expenditures on and off for purposes of stabilizing the economy inevitably run up against the hard fact that public spending is slow to start up and difficult to stop suddenly, unless we wish to build excessive waste into public budgets.

It is further characteristic of public expenditures that there must be continuing concern for the achievement of an appropriate balance between Federal responsibility for essential public services and the coordinate responsibility on the part of State and local units of government. Considerations both of economy and flexibility in adapting to differing local requirements call for decisionmaking at that level of government consistent with the character of the specified program. Thus, it is clear that national defense and the space program must be tasks of the Federal Government, while it is equally clear that such functions as police and fire protection are local matters. However, there are a number of important areas where there are strong arguments for coordinated actions by all levels of government. Familiar fields are education, health and welfare, conservation, housing, urban renewal, mass transit, and even encouragement of the arts and humanities.

If public expenditure programs are guided by considerations of long-term needs, then the Government programs at all levels will make a maximum contribution to economic stability. Undoubtedly, we will not be able to make every conceivable expenditure that might be in the public interest. There are limits to our resources, large as they are. But in an economy in which per capita gross national product is growing by 2½ percent per year in real terms, and is rapidly approaching a trillion dollars per year, we should certainly be able to afford sufficient public exepnditures to meet many of these needs, providing a richer, and more interesting life to all and a minimum level of decency and comfort for every American.

ANTI-INFLATION POLICIES

We must maintain a stable general level of prices if our programs for a full employment economy are to succeed in the long run.

Inflation is not a pressing danger when there is substantial unemployment of labor, broad scale idle capacity in industry, and severe competition for customers and jobs. It is only when economic policy is successful enough to generate full employment of labor and capital that inflation offers any serious problem.[3]

Inflation encourages inefficiency in the allocation of resources; it leads to instability, recession, and unemployment; it contributes to balance-of-payments difficulties; and it jeopardizes the success of programs for income maintenance. It generally hits hardest those families and individuals who can least afford to bear its burdens.

Clearly, an appropriate balance between monetary and fiscal policies is the first prerequisite to an anti-inflation program.

Thus, to the extent that the war in Vietnam or other international developments require an increased proportion of our national resources, fiscal and monetary policies should be readjusted to insure that this does not produce inflation. In the process any curtailing of public programs or of private

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

spending should be concentrated where they will reduce the competition for scarce labor, materials, and industrial capacity. At the same time, we must continue the drive against poverty by programs carefully designed to provide jobs for those whom the normal labor market processes leave without work opportunities.

Over and beyond government monetary and fiscal policies, it is necessary that business and labor cooperate in generating wages and prices that are consistent with a noninflationary, full employment economy. We believe that if labor and industry and government officials all understand the requirements of such a policy, they will find ways to operate a flexible and, at the same time, noninflationary system of price and wage adjustments without need for direct wage and price controls.

The Council of Economic Advisers wage-price guidelines are a start in this direction and they have received Presidential endorsement as well as widespread congressional and public support. We should strengthen the existing wage-price guidelines activities of the President and his Council and should also investigate the possibilities for establishing procedures for makng such judgments which allow the public, including industry and labor, to participate in their development. The possibility of regular congressional review of the guidelines and responses to them also merits analysis and consideration. Public hearings, giving the various interests a platform, might be another way to provide an atmosphere conducive to responsible decisionmaking.

In addition, it is necessary to preserve the benefits of free competition by vigorous governmental action, particularly antitrust action. Our living standards reflect our success in using free competition, decentralized, economic power, and marketplace allocation of goods and services. These have stimulated efficient production, technological progress, managerial innovations, and provided greater consumer choice than any other economic system known to man. Therefore, we urge the most vigorous efforts possible on the part of regulatory agencies to curb unfair business practices and to preserve the benefits of free competition.

EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, TRAINING: A WAY OUT OF POVERTY

Employment at a living wage plus basic education and training are needed by most of those now living in poverty. Full participation in American life and escape from poverty, discrimination and ghetto living require opportunities for jobs, education, and training far beyond those now being provided.

Poverty is not a homogeneous product, and the War on Poverty must use many weapons. In combating poverty, lasting benefits will come only from programs which enable the poor to take and keep themselves out of poverty. Any program which does not have this as a goal would require a continuation of the present and apparently unending flow of benefits to the same families, generation after generation.

For those for whom self-support is not possible, a comprehensive attack on poverty must be supported by other appropriate income-maintenance measures.

However, the primary emphasis in the comprehensive attack on poverty must be on programs designed to facilitate the escape from poverty by way of education, training, and employment. Progress will be facilitated in an economy where aggregate demand is adequate to provide a full employment environment. Changes in the level of demand have significant impact on the effectiveness of various components of the program. Thus, programs now underway to provide the basic and vocational skills required for successful entry into the labor market can only be effective if there are job openings. Since one of the primary goals has been to change hopelessness and despair into confidence and determination, if there are no jobs for those who have qualified themselves the programs may have negative effects. Our dynamic economy has never, even in the depresion, been without job openings, and the notion of filling all of them is as absurd as the idea of eliminating all, even frictional, unemployment. Thus, even if the economy stimulated by an expanded war effort in Vietnam should produce 3 percent unemployment less than 10 percent of those families now in poverty would be lifted above the poverty line and the level of unemployment among Negroes would be unacceptably high. Thus it is clear that there will not be jobs for the people we are trying to help unless positive steps are taken.

In our economy, more than 14 million people experience unemployment every year. This year, 500,000 were unemployed for over 15 weeks, and about 300,000 for over 26 weeks. Perhaps the most discouraging fact is that 2 million family heads who worked full time do not earn enough to live above the poverty line. In addition, it is estimated that about 2 million poor people have given up looking for jobs and are not counted as unemployed in the statistics, though they could, if given the chance, be productive members of society.

Table I estimates the changes occurring in the poverty status of families and unrelated individuals as national unemployment decreases from the March 1964 rate of 5.4 percent to 3 percent. As can be seen the effects are impressive—over 2 million people would be released from the shackles of poverty.

However, even at this rate of unemployment there will remain many among the poor who lack the opportunity to assume a productive place in society. While this so-called hard core could be reduced by further increases in total demand through tax reduction or general expenditure increase the resultant inflationary pressures would be greater than we are able to assume. In these circumstances, creation of special programs to provide opportunities for about 1 million would be most effective particularly if in the process basic education and training are provided. Such an effort could, if necessary, be increased for as table II shows the potential for such jobs in our economy is very great. Such efforts would reduce unemployment while minimizing the risk of inflation. As a byproduct, we would have a more skilled and productive labor force. This is critical now, when rising demands of the Vietnam war threaten to create inflationary pressures and a tight labor market.

Therefore, we propose a public employment-training program stressing subprofessional and aid-type employment and training for jobs which serve the public interest.

TABLE 1.—*Changes in poverty population with fall in national unemployment rates*

	Number of people in poverty in March 1964 at 5.4 percent unemployment rate	Estimated number of people moving out of poverty when unemployment rate falls from 5.4 to 4.5 percent	Estimated number of people moving out of poverty when unemployment rate falls from 5.4 to 3 percent
Members of male-headed families	22,100,000	[1] 612,000	1,600,000
Members of female-headed families	7,600,000	160,000	520,000
Unrelated individuals (females)	3,500,000	47,000	140,000
Unrelated individuals (males)	1,400,000	34,000	110,000
Total	34,600,000	853,000	2,350,000

[1] Including heads and children.

TABLE II.—*Potential for public jobs*

	Potential employment [1] *(in thousands)*
Great Society goals:	
Health	1,200
Education (including libraries)	2,000
Beautification and recreation	1,000
Urban improvement and development (including transportation)	600
Welfare and other public services (including control and prevention of crime and delinquency)	300
Total	5,100

[1] These figures are estimates and are used to illustrate orders of magnitude.

Such a public employment-training program could satisfy a coincidence of needs in our economy. The need for jobs for the poor, the need for better prepared workers, and the need for public services for the Nation are equally important and compelling justifications for this program. A program to expand the opportunities for useful jobs would (1) give many of the unemployed poor a chance to lift themselves out of poverty by work and training which better prepared them while providing satisfaction and adequate wages and (2) at the same time, provide services in areas where resources have not been developed or allocated to meet long recognized public needs.

The program would not have to create either the needs or the labor resources; they already exist. It would bring into the active labor market those who otherwise would be doomed to live out their lives outside of the economy. It would do this by providing Federal financial support for wages. The public has been crying for improved services in the fields of health, education, urban improvement, beautification, etc.

Under such a program, subprofessional jobs created in medical institutions could provide needed assistance to doctors and nurses. These jobs could include nurses' aids, physical therapy aids, dietitians' aids, and orderlies. It would also be possible to provide better nursing homes and care for the aged by training aids for the nurses and therapists for home visitation services.

In the schools, there are needs for teacher-aids, as well as for recreation and playground aids. Added personnel would enable us to open schools, libraries, museums, art galleries, and playgrounds on evenings and weekends and during summers.

Additional subprofessional help can improve the beauty of our Nation by working in highway maintenance and gardening, waterfront cleanup, groundskeeping, park construction and maintenance, slum cleanup, and minor repair of public buildings. Urban life could be further improved by the work of aids to building inspectors, public health officials, sanitation officials, air and water pollution control personnel.

Outreach service provided by aids could help our welfare and social service agencies to reach those whom we have failed in the past. Homemakers and other home helpers could mean needed services for the chronically ill and large families. The control and prevention of crime and delinquency could benefit from the insights and assistance provided by police and probation aids.

These are but a few examples; once the program is in operation private and public organizations will develop additional jobs of this type.

The ideal would be to furnish a job with basic education and training which could open opportunities in the public service for the poor. Ultimately, acquisition of education, work discipline and work experience will enable many to acquire upward mobility and make the shift into private employment.

The structure of the program should be one of direct employment by public and nonprofit private institutions receiving Federal reimbursement for the wages, supervision, and training expenses. A cash contribution (perhaps 10 percent) by the employing institution would insure that the new employees were performing useful and constructive function. There would need to be a maintenance effort provision to insure that the program was not used to avoid increases to meet normal increases in loads.

The public employees will be trained on the job by the institutions which hire them. This approach to training for subprofessional jobs is current practice. In some cases, more extensive vocational training may be necessary before the employee starts working on the job, and it is expected that this would be provided for by the hiring institution, or by Government-sponsored programs.

Success in breaking the poverty cycle will gradually reduce the number who cannot move up the vocational ladder for one reason or another. Hence, eventually the program should produce its own demise, out of its very success in reducing poverty.

A public employment-training program would have a number of spillover effects.

The program by increasing the demand for this type of labor would tend to reinforce existing statutory minimum wages. Since wages would be at the low end of the wage scale, there would be an incentive for workers to move into private sector employment. Further, the program could acquaint the employer with the advantages of nondiscriminatory hiring of persons willing to work and eager to acquire new skills. The program would not require the initiation of a large amount of supportive services but would draw upon already existing programs.

The program represents an investment in individuals who through experience have been convinced that little is expected of them and who fulfill this prophecy.

The philosophy of the program is simple: (1) The work to be performed is both useful and needed and (2) there is, among the poor, a tremendous reservoir of latent potential which can and must be tapped—for as a nation we cannot afford to forgo the fruits of their labor. In a real sense, we can draw an analogy between many of these individuals and our returning GI's after World War II. Just as the latter had been deprived of 2, 3, or 4 years of education and training at a vital juncture in their lives, the former have been deprived of the opportunity to enter the mainstream of American life. As the GI bill was, in large measure, an answer in the first instance; a well-balanced program of useful work, basic education, and training can be expected to assist the vast majority of the poor in finding a new sense of personal dignity and worth by making a substantial contribution to themselves and their society.

---

[1] With the rate of technological progress remaining high, it would be a bold man indeed who concluded that we would increase our real output per worker any less rapidly in the 1970's than in recent years. This would mean that with employment rising at 1½ percent per year and output per worker at almost 3 percent per year, total real output of goods and services (real gross national product) would need to rise at least 4 percent per year during the 1970's if unemployment is to remain stable.

In addition, the general level of prices tends to go up about 1½ percent per year. (It appears that when wholesale prices are approximately constant, as in recent years, the average value per unit of gross national product (gross national product deflator) has risen about 1½ percent per year. The experts seem to believe that this reflects both imperfections in the measurement of quality changes in our price indexes and the treatment of Government wage increases as prices increase, though this is not the practice in regard to the private economy.) If we assume this will continue in the future as in the past, then in current prices gross national product would continue to increase at about 5½ percent per year at full employment and by 1980 would be more than double this year's output, or about $1½ trillion in 1980 dollars.

The population might reach 245 million by 1980, which means that the amount of goods and services produced would be about $6,200 per person in 1980 as compared to about $3,500 in 1965. This would mean that a 75-percent increase in the output of goods and services per capita, including the effects of continued modest price increases.

[2] This does not mean the relevant choice is between all public or all private expenditures. When public expenditures are used, the initial increase in output occurs in the public sector, but succeeding increases occur in the private sector. The real choice is, therefore, between whether the initial round of expenditures should occur in the private or public sector.

[3] In this country we are a good deal more sensitive to inflation than are other industrialized nations, including Japan and our West European allies. Over the past decade, our record of price stability has been unmatched by any of these nations. On the other hand, these countries are a good deal more sensitive to unemployment as shown by their unwillingness to accept unemployment above 2 percent.

New Look at Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Jonesboro Sun, published in Jonesboro, Ark., serves that vast agricultural area in northeast Arkansas, and its editorial policies over the years have consistently served the farmer, the businesses serving the agricultural economy, and the best interest of this Nation.

On January 14, 1966, the Jonesboro Sun carried a most thoughtful editorial concerning hunger in the world and American agricultural policies curtailing production of food commodities. The editorial properly points out that the time is urgent to reappraise our approach to agriculture—which is the foundation of our own American prosperity and strength and which should be the basic tool in our international programs to oppose aggression and expand the domain of democracy and freedom.

The Farm Act of 1965 included a provision on cropland adjustment the purpose of which was to further reduce the size of the agricultural plant by putting cropland, alfalfa, and tame hay lands into this newly created soil bank for a period of years. I pointed out to the House the fallacy of such a program and urged that this title to the law be stricken.

The editorial follows:

NEW LOOK AT CROPS

After decades of promoting decreases in farm production, are U.S. agriculture officials about to trigger a let's-grow-more-food campaign? That question is heard frequently in Washington as uncertainty over the future of U.S. food in a hungry world begins to give way to a new look at agriculture.

Two factors have combined to stall the campaign to encourage farmers to produce less. Food shortages in the world which have reached famine proportions in India and threaten similar degeneration in parts of Africa and Latin America, and the disappearance from the surplus list of some of America's largest crops.

Except for normal reserves, surplus stocks of wheat and feed grains will completely disappear in another year. It may be necessary to remove some controls from these crops to keep production even with requirements. Even so, the 1965 farm law calls for removing 8 million acres a year out of production for the next 5 years.

Taking 10 percent of the Nation's cultivated acreage out of production at a time when India literally is staring starvation in the face may seem like poor public relations. But India's famine is so widespread, its docks and distribution systems so inadequate, shipping fleets of foodstuffs from the United States right now could not stop the impending disaster.

Like many other countries which have been the recipients of large quantities of American food in the past, India has done little to improve crop production within its own borders. The President has said future shipments under the food-for-peace program will be tied to meaningful self-help by the recipients.

Those sentiments have been expressed before in high places, but until they are implemented the list of Indias may become distressingly long.

Dr. Zenon R. Wynnytsky, an Outstanding and Courageous American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to an article which recently appeared in the Ukrainian Catholic Daily, the official organ of the Providence Association of Ukrainian Catholics in America. The article itself is the speech of Dr. Zenon R. Wynnytsky which was delivered on the occasion of a rally held in Cleveland, Ohio, on October 16, 1965.

Dr. Wynnytsky is not only a distinguished member of the medical profession but in my opinion, an outstanding and courageous American who has chosen to speak out repeatedly against the menace of international communism. Dr. Wynnytsky can be regarded as an expert on tyranny and aggression in the world in which we live for in earlier days he was identified as Prisoner No. 57377 and Prisoner No. 118497 respectively in the Nazi concentration camps at Auschwitz and Mauthausen.

In years past he felt the terror of fascism and how it destroyed the freedom of individuals and nations. He now speaks out with clarity concerning the terror of the international Communist conspiracy in the world.

His comments at the Cleveland rally on October 16, 1965, should be must reading for every American who today is being lulled into complacency and led by clever propagandists to believe that in the last analysis the free world has little to fear by reason of this spread of Communist influence in the world in which we live.

I seriously recommend that each and every Member of this House heed well the warning expressed in Dr. Wynnytsky's remarks lest we be lulled to sleep and ultimately awake to find our freedom and liberty has been withdrawn.

Dr. Wynnytsky's remarks follow:

I am a medical doctor and a resident of Metropolitan Cleveland since 1952, and now a U.S. citizen not by the coincidence of birth but by the free choice of a freeman. I emphasize this statement, for I know what slavery means. At one time I was prisoner No. 57377 and No. 118497, respectively, in the Nazi concentration camps of Auschwitz and Mauthausen during the Second World War years of 1941–45.

After being a freshman at the Lviv State Medical School in Ukraine, I came to value in the Nazi universities of Auschwitz and Mauthausen the ideals of freedom for people and nations, the meaning of democracy and justice and came to fear the terror of the brown and red totalitarian political systems. Therefore, I came to the United States of America, to a stronghold of freedom and democracy which I never knew before.

As chairman of the advisory board of the Organization for Defense of the Four Freedoms of Ukraine, Inc. (an organization similar to the Jewish B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation League), and executive director of the Ukrainian section of Cleveland's American Friends of the anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, known as ABN, I certainly would like to assure all of you that our primary objective and the objective of all Clevelanders of Ukranian descent, is to safeguard our heritage as well as to maintain and preserve our U.S. Constitution and all the liberties which is guarantees. Accordingly let us say that the first enemy of the U.S. Constitution and our liberties, of our American way of life, and human freedom, and dignity is undoubtedly the world Communst movement.

A few months ago the Honorable Mary V. Beck, the first councilwoman of the city of Detroit, Mich., who recently visited several countries behind the Iron Curtain, made the following statement: "For communism, be it Russian or Chinese, has only one goal and it is world domination under Moscow's Peiping's rule" aiming at the destruction of the old Christian culture and tradition and of human freedom and dignity. A soft policy toward communism today may offer to us and later generations new Pearl Harbors, new Bataan Marches, new concentration camps and a new hell on this planet.

Considering such an outlook we may indeed be sure that we are supporting the proper policy of the U.S. Government in the Vietnam crisis. Our brave youngsters are defending our theistic culture, the principles of freedom of individuals and nations, and the integrity and security of our own homes, our families and our children. There is no substitute for victory. Therefore, down with communism. Let us unite our efforts to achieve victory in Vietnam.

In 1918 Ukraine was the first victim of Communist aggression. We learned that the Communists were ready to promise a paradise to achieve their goal of world domination. American youth. Awake. Do not follow the misleading slogans of Communist prophets. They are preparing a grave for you and all of mankind. Combat communism everywhere in the world; in Vietnam, in Cuba, in Latin America, and also here in our United States of America.

Americans, pray and work for our victory in Vietnam. Do not expose the future happiness of your country and your children to the lies and experiments of the big Communist brother. And let me reassure you that when the time comes and we are called to arms, we—the Americans of Ukrainian descent, will fight and die if necessary for our beloved adopted land. There is no other more honorable way to die than as a free man in the defense of a free country. Don't wait to die as a slave. Don't kid yourself that Communists will provide you with an easy and joyful life. They may promise it to you. But nobody has seen it under their rule.

We must be victorious in Vietnam if we hope to maintain our freedom and the freedom of millions of people in Asia. Only a victory over Communist aggression can bring true peace to our troubled world. Carthaginam delendam esse.

Remarks of Mohammed El Fasi of Morocco at Bridgeport University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, our friendship with Morocco goes back to the founding days of our Nation when that country became the first nation to recognize the independence of the United States during the Revolutionary War period.

These ties have not lossened through the years, as was pointed out recently at the University of Bridgeport by Mohammed El Fasi, rector of Moroccan universities and chairman of the executive board of UNESCO, when he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from the university.

In the belief that Dr. El Fasi's speech as well as the introductory remarks of Dr. James H. Halsey, university chancellor, will be of interest to my colleagues, I am inserting them in the Record at this point:

Remarks of Chancellor Halsey

Mr. President, members of the board of trustees and the faculty, students of the university, ladies, and gentlemen, I have the honor to present his Excellency the Honorable Mohammed El Fasi, of Morocco, for an honorary degree.

Mr. El Fasi comes to our campus through the interest and courtesy of one of our trustees, the Honorable William Benton, U.S. Ambassador to UNESCO. We are sorry that official United Nations responsibilities prevent Ambassador Benton's presence today, because we had hoped he would present Mr. El Fasi for this honor.

As rector of Moroccan universities, Mr. El Fasi is the foremost figure in the field of Moroccan education. Not only does this responsibility involve administrative supervision of all higher education in Morocco, but it also means that he is in charge of all scientific research, art, archaeology, and folklore activities of his country.

A distinguished scholar, who speaks six languages, Mr. El Fasi is now adding English as the seventh to his linguistic abilities, and today he will deliver the first public speech in English in his entire career. Mr. El Fasi has earned several degrees at French and Moroccan universities, he has written numerous articles and books on Moroccan literature, history, and biography, and he has held many positions of prominence and high responsibility in Moroccan education. One of these was as the personal tutor to the present King of Morocco, Hassan II, during this monarch's boyhood and youthful years.

Mr. El Fasi is a well-known internationalist who is profoundly concerned about world affairs, and these interests have taken him to many parts of the globe in pursuit of better international relations and world peace. He has been associated with the United Nations and UNESCO since 1958, and last year he was elected Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO.

Mr. President, it is a great honor and a rare privilege for us to have so distinguished a visitor as his Excellency, the Honorable Mohammed El Fasi, on our campus, and I take great pride in presenting him to you at this time for an honorary degree.

Speech of Dr. El Fasi

I would like first of all to convey to you the greetings of the teaching corps of a university which bears the name of our national hero, the late King Mohamed V, liberator of Morocco and champion of Africa's independence, this monarch who preferred exile and deportation in order to secure for his people a life of honor and dignity and who returned victorious from the remote island of Madagascar after more than 2 years of estrangement to proclaim the independence of Morocco.

If I believe it necessary at the beginning of this speech to recall these historical facts, it is in order to stress the common line between our two peoples, the one of attachment to liberty. It is not by a hazardous fact that Morocco was the first country to recognize the independence of the United States. On the throne of Morocco reigned at that time a great king, Mohamed III, the ancestor of the present King, known in our history for his tolerance and liberalism. At the proclamation of the independence of the United States, he hastened to show his great happiness at this event and gave orders to put at the disposal of the American authorities a building in Tangiers, the diplomatic capital of his Empire, to house their first Consulate in our country. After this recognition, a correspondence, famous in the history of our two countries, was established between King Mohamed ben Abdallah and the authorities of the United States.

Thus, on August 17, 1788, a letter was sent by the King to the President of the American Congress. Without waiting for an answer to his missive, some disputes having occurred between the United States and the Pachas of Tunis and Tripoli, Mohamed III wrote to these two Pachas in order to intervene in favor of the United States. After his election as the first President, Washington, addressed to the King the answer in which he told him particularly:

"The United States, having unanimously appointed me to the supreme executive authority in this Nation, Your Majesty's letter of the 17th of August 1788, which, by reason of the dissolution of the late Government, remained unanswered, has been delivered to me. I have also received the letters, which Your Imperial Majesty has been so kind as to write, in favor of the United States, to the Bashaws of Tunis and Tripoli, and I present to you the sincere acknowledgements and thanks of the United States, for this important mark of your friendship for them."

We noticed equally in this letter the following sentences: "The encouragement which Your Majesty has been pleased, generously, to give to our commerce with your dominions, the punctuality with which you have caused the treaty with us to be observed, and the just and generous measure taken in the case of Captain Proctor, make a deep impression on the United States and confirm their respect for, and attachment to Your Imperial Majesty.

It gives me pleasure to have this opportunity of assuring Your Majesty that, while I remain at the head of this Nation, I shall not cease to promote every measure that may conduce to the friendship and harmony which so happily subsist between your empire and them, and shall esteem myself happy in every occasion of convincing Your Majesty of the high sense (which in common with the whole Nation) I entertain of the magnanimity, wisdom, and benevolence of Your Majesty."

Since then, this friendship, established under these very high auspices, has not ceased to develop and to maintain itself despite all the vicissitudes of history. Thus, it is a great pleasure and honor for me to be the messenger of this friendship.

Mr. President, the council of your university and yourself conferred this distinguished honor on me by awarding me the title of doctor honoris cause. In expressing my very deep thanks, I would like to see this homage given to my country, to the University Mohamed V and to myself at the same time. In fact, Morocco, as you know, boasts the oldest university in the world, this Quaraouiyyine of the city of Fez which transmitted to the world, through Moslem Spain, the Arabic numbers, the basis of all modern science. We celebrated in 1959, the 11th centenary of this university of which I was president for 10 years and which was founded in 859 by a woman, Fatima Oumm al Banine.

During the last centuries of its long existence, this university had limited its activity to the studies of theology, law, and literature and preserved the medieval and scholastic methods of teaching. The opportunity was given to me to introduce a new spirit and disciplines that had been abandoned for a long time. But the need for a modern higher educational system was felt as soon as we regained our independence. And this is why, in continuing to give the greatest interest to the old University Quaraouiyyine, the Government of His Majesty in which I served as Minister of National Education during the first 3 years of independence, has studied this problem and has decided to create a modern university in Rabat. For some 40 years, there were few institutes that provided a higher education in the fields of science, law, and literature. These institutes were transformed into faculties and were united as a coherent university system that took the name of University Mohamed V. During the month of December 1957, the solemn inauguration of this young university took place under the presidency of King Mohamed V and in the presence of several presidents of foreign universities. Our university has, therefore, only 8 years of existence, but during this short period, tremendous progress has been achieved. The number of students has increased from some hundreds to 8,000, a school of engineering was created which has already graduated many technicians for private and public sectors. A school of medicine, first in Casablanca, then a whole faculty in Rabat, achieved the cycle of the classical higher education.

Other higher institutes and establishments (sociology, political sciences, etc.) were created afterward. A university center for scientific research (which was formed 4 years ago) was put in charge of coordinating research in all fields and in supervising the publications of all faculties and institutes. In addition to the reviews that existed before, the university center of scientific research founded a review in Arabic, Al Bahth Al Ilmi (the Scientific Research) which is considered at the present time in the whole Arab world as a review of great value.

At the beginning, the activities of our university were limited to the city of Rabat, the administrative capital of the country. Later, annexes of some faculties were extended to other cities, in particular to Fes, the metropolis of Islam and culture, as well as to Casablanca, Tetouan, and Marrakesh. The general library, which is at the same time the National Library and the university library, has branches in all the cultural centers of Morocco. Its department of manuscripts is one of the richest in the world and attracts researchers from all the horizons.

From the point of view of social work, two groups of university centers have been established in Rabat and in Fes for our students: they comprise dormitories, restaurants, libraries, lounges, and all the necessary installations for a fruitful student life. A special office takes care of the sports activities in which our youth participate with enthusiasm. A special day of university sports is held each year during which students from all the schools of higher learning compete in a healthy atmosphere of true sportsmanship.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, this necessarily brief account of our university, I hope, will give you some idea of what we are doing to participate in the tremendous work of renovation and of economic and social development undertaken by our people and our Government since the dawn of independence. But what still remains to be done is much more important and our needs in this domain are huge. In fact, the actual number of our students is still small because the primary and secondary educational sources that feed the university were insufficiently developed during the protectorate. Gigantic efforts were put forth during the first years of independence.

Where formerly the primary schools received only 15,000 pupils per year, in the 2 years following independence as head of the Ministry of National Education I was able to put 500,000 new children of both sexes into schools. We are, therefore, waiting to receive at the university in October 1967 more than 10,000 new students. This shows you all the keenness of the problem of higher education in a developing country that (even if its infrastructure is one of the more advanced on the African Continent) lacks sufficient resources to face its needs especially in the social field and above all in education. If you add to these data, a population, whose rate of growth is one of the highest in the world (more than 3 percent), you will grasp the alarming nature of our problem. But we are counting heavily on the aid of our friends in order to find happy solutions to this situation. Solidarity among peoples is today a supreme duty. We cannot conceive an international life, founded on peace and security, without the exercise of this solidarity.

It is not only an act of high moral standing to help those who need resources to achieve their economic and social development, but it is in the well-understood interest of each nation enjoying wealth and progress to help others to have access to this life of dignity and happiness which is the sole one which can secure mutual comprehension and tranquility of minds, in one word—peace.

UNESCO, on which I have the honor to preside on the executive board and where my honorable friend, Mr. Benton, one of the most eminent persons of this Areopagus also sits, works tirelessly in this domain of aid to the developing countries in the fields of education, science, and culture which are under its purview. But the means are limited and far from satisfying the needs of those countries on the way to development.

Other international organizations such as UNICEF, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the World Health Organization, and other nongovernmental organizations work also in this direction. But in my opinion, only direct action by the developed countries and their great foundations can bring efficient aid to the developing countries to uproot them from this tragic situation which is prejudicial to the world's peace. This aid must be shown first of all in the domain of higher education because it is unanimously known today that the essential elements of development are the formation of the high ranks of a nation and scientific research, the two poles of the activities of the universities and of all establishments of higher learning.

A country without engineers, without professors, without doctors, without administrators and without an educated elite cannot have access to a high standard of material and moral living. Even if it possesses sufficient natural resources, it cannot exploit and utilize them fruitfully if it does not have competent personnel. And it is exactly the university that forms the latter. A great responsibility devolves on us, the university people, and it is here that the greatness of our mission lies. But we need encouragement and comprehension on the part of those who are able to give us the proper means which will allow us to fulfill our noble duty. May God help us and inspire all men of good will with the determination to work in the cause of happiness and peace for all humanity.

Mr. President, thank you very much for this honor.

Asian Bank Development Bill Being Introduced in House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing in the House an Asian Development Bank Act which provides for the participation of the United States in the proposed Asian Development Bank. It is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the Asian Development Bank

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congresss assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Asian Development Bank Act."

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the Asian Development Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "Bank") provided for by the agreement establishing the Bank (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement") deposited in the archives of the United Nations.

SEC. (a) The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a Governor of the Bank, an alternate for the Governor, and a Director of the Bank.

(b) No person shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor or Alternate Governor. The Director may, in the discretion of the President, receive such compensation, allowances, and other benefits as, together with those received by him from the Bank, will equal those authorized for a Chief of Mission, Class 2, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

SEC. 4. (a) The policies and operations of the representatives of the United States on the Bank shall be coordinated with other United States policies in such manner as the President shall direct.

(b) An annual report with respect to United States participation in the Bank shall be submitted to the Congress by such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

SEC. 5. Unless the Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional shares of stock of the Bank; (b) vote for or agree to any amendment of the agreement which increases the obligations of the United States, or which would change the purpose or functions of the Bank; or (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Bank, except that loans or other financing may be provided to the Bank by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to make loans or provide other financing to international organizations.

DEPOSITORIES

SEC. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Bank shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the purchase of 20,000 shares of capital stock of the Bank, $200 million.

(b) Any payment made to the United States by the Bank as a distribution of net income shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

SEC. 8. For the purpose of any civil action which may be brought within the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by or against the Bank in accordance with the agreement, the Bank shall be deeemd to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office or agency in the United States is located, and any such action to which the Bank shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States, including the courts enumerated in Title 28, sec. 460, United States Code, shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Bank is a defendant in any action in a State court, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES

SEC. 9. The agreement, and particularly Articles 49 through 56, shall have full force and effect in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Pureto Rico, upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Bank. The President, at the time of deposit of the instrument of acceptance of membership by the United States in the Bank, shall also deposit a declaration that the United States retains for itself and its political subdivisions the right to tax salaries and emoluments paid by the Bank to its citizens or nationals.

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS INVESTMENT SECURITIES FOR NATIONAL BANKS

SEC. 10. The last sentence of paragraph 7 of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by striking the word "or" after the words "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting after the words "the Inter-American Development Bank" the words "or the Asian Development Bank".

SECURITIES ISSUED BY BANK AS EXEMPT SECURITIES; REPORT FILED WITH SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Any securities issued by the Bank (including any guarantee by the Bank, whether or not limited in scope) in connection with raising of funds for inclusion in the Bank's ordinary capital resources as defined in article 7 of the agreement and any securities guaranteed by the Bank as to both principal and interest to which the commitment in article 6, section 5, of the agreement is expressly applicable, shall be deemed to be exempted securities within the meaning of paragraph (a)(2) of section 3 of the Act of May 27, 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), and paragraph (a)(12) of section 3 of the Act of June 6, 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c). The Bank shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission such annual and other reports with regard to such securities as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate in view of the special character of the Bank and its operations and necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(b) The Securities and Exchange Commission, acting in consultation with such agency or officer as the President shall designate, is authorized to suspend the provisions of subsection (a) at any time as to any or all securities issued or guaranteed by the Bank during the period of such suspension. The Commission shall include in its annual reports to Congress such information as it shall deem advisable with regard to the operations and effect of this section and in connection therewith shall include any views submitted for such purpose by any association of dealers registered with the Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee will consider this legislation as its next item of business.

Preschool Plan—School Election Result Ignored in New Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ross Hermann of the Indianapolis News editorial staff has written an article depicting the results of Federal meddling in an Indiana school system.

The facts presented by Mr. Hermann, a most knowledgeable writer on these affairs, offer a sad commentary on the interference of the Federal Government with the wishes and desires of Indiana residents.

In order that all Members of Congress be apprised of the arrogant, wasteful and partisan activities of the Federal Government in the area of education, I am submitting Mr. Hermann's article from the December 21, 1966, edition of the Indianapolis News, for the RECORD, under unanimous consent.

The article follows:

PRESCHOOL PLAN—SCHOOL ELECTION RESULT IGNORED IN NEW BOARD

(By Ross Hermann)

The Federal Government apparently dislikes the results of the last Indianapolis school board election.

That observation is prompted by the fact that Sargent Shriver's Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington has put into sensitive positions in its preschool program here influential members of the losing side in the city's May 1965 board of school commissioners election, the Nonpartisans for Better Schools Committee.

In contrast, the victorious group, the Citizens School Committee, is unrepresented on the preschool program's board of directors, a federally financed offshoot of the Johnson administration's "war on poverty."

Citizens Committee leaders charge the "antipoverty" set-up, involving a sizable infusion of Federal funds, has the earmarks of an effort to build up the Nonpartisans for a second try at election to the school board.

President of the board of directors of Indianapolis Pre-School Centers, Inc., is Mrs. Amelia G. Cook, who waged a losing campaign for a school board seat as a nominee of the nonpartisans. Mrs. Cook, although rejected at the polls, heads an organization in charge of training preschool children from underprivileged backgrounds and, incidentally, directs disposal of an $892,700 budget—two-thirds of which goes for salaries.

Another member of the preschool centers board active in the nonpartisans is Dr. F. Benjamin Davis, who served the unsuccessful campaign as second vice president.

Other preschool centers board members associated with the nonpartisan committee include Mrs. Pauline Morton-Finney and Mrs. James Spall.

No member of the board, on the other hand, is affiliated with the citizens school committee, according to its new president, Wallace S. Sims. Pointing to the citizens group as a dominant force in education since 1926 when it ousted the Ku Klux Klan from school board control, Sims charges the preschool setup is "totally unrepresentative of the entire community."

Circuit Court Judge John L. Niblack, president of the citizens committee at the time of its 1964 victory, makes the same charge. He calls the federally backed preschool board "highly unrepresentative and totally exclusive of the people who elected the present school board."

He charges further: "The Federal Government has shown by the preschool program it is opposed to local self-government in Indianapolis and is doing everything in its power to abolish it."

Mrs. Cook counters that political considerations did not enter into selection of preschool board members. "It wasn't organized on that level," she says. "It was organized on a service level."

The board's composition, in Sims' opinion, speaks for itself. "The preschool program," he says, "looks to me like an effective way to build up an organization for the next election by the use of Federal funds."

Tribute to Air Force Systems Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our national defense budget is reaching record heights, it is most heartening to know that the officers and men of our armed services are performing their vital tasks with full efficiency and economy. Recently a summary of the fine work of the Air Force Systems Command was sent to me by Mr. J. Cookman Boyd, Jr., of Baltimore, who visited several installations of that command as a member of a group representing the Maryland Academy of Sciences. Mr. Boyd's comments on the hospitality and courtesy of Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, and the personnel under his command are worthy of attention by the Congress. As he concludes:

> Suffice it to say, of the 30 persons in our expedition, none was left without a feeling of intense admiration for the personnel and manner in which they are carrying out their assignments.

Mr. Boyd's letter follows:

Sauerwein, Benson & Boyd,
Baltimore, Md., December 28, 1965.

Hon. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Charlie: Recently it was my pleasure and profit as part of a group representing the Maryland Academy of Sciences to be the guest of Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, to visit the installations of that command at Andrews Air Force Base, Arnold Air Force Station, Brooks Air Force Base, and the installations at the cape in Florida.

Entirely aside from the courtesies extended and the excellent briefings we received, one cannot have such an experience without being impressed with the dedication, sincerity, and of particular interest to a reasonably conservative person like myself, a constant interest in economy wherever possible that runs throughout the personnel of this tremendously important organization.

It would be impracticable to try to discuss here the details which we found so interesting on our trip. Perhaps when we meet about the State there might be an opportunity to speak in more detail. In the meantime, suffice it to say, of the 30 persons in our expedition, none was left without a feeling of intense admiration for the personnel and manner in which they are carrying out their assignments in the Systems Command.

Sincerely,

J. Cookman Boyd, Jr.

Must Back Viet Fight, Says Claude Callegary, National Commander of Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Claude Callegary, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans was interviewed by the Cincinnati Enquirer upon his return from Vietnam. The interview was carried in th eissue of January 7. I am pleased to insert a copy of this interview in the Record:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Jan. 7, 1966]

MUST BACK VIET FIGHT, DAV CHIEF SAYS HERE

(By Emil Dansker of the Enquirer staff)

A man who knows war through his own tragic experience spoke out here Thursday in full support of U.S. involvement in the conflict in Vietnam.

"Either we stand here or we fall here," declared Claude L. Callegary, of Baltimore, attorney and national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. Callegary, seriously wounded in a plane crash while serving in the South Pacific in World War II, was in Cincinnati to announce a stepped-up DAV effort in support of the war in Vietnam and on behalf of troops wounded while fighting with United States and South Vietnamese forces.

These include—

A campaign that will involve the mailing of some 10 million "Support Our Fighting Men in Vietnam" bumper stickers and fund requests.

Recomendations to Congress that Korean GI bill benefits be extended to Vietnam wounded.

A so-called "Amp to Amp" campaign to gather wheelchairs and artificial limbs for Vietnamese amputees.

The latter program, Mr. Callegary said, is based on the intimate knowledge of such a need by DAV members, many of whom are themselves amputees.

He conceived the idea, he said, after visiting Vietnamese military hospitals, which he described as saturated with wounded and unable to supply enough artificial limbs.

This is especially important, he pointed out, since Vietnam is a nation in which the bicycle is standard transportation.

Mr. Callegary's tour took him from the United States to Hawaii last December 5 and then on to Formosa, Japan, Hong Kong, the Philippines and South Vietnam.

He received top-secret briefing along the way that added up, as he put it, to a view of the Vietnam conflict that "falls together just like a jigsaw puzzle."

When you visit these countries you find these people living in the shadow of China—and I deliberately don't say Red China because this seems to inflame some people—which instead of concentrating on its own 750 million people has adopted an aggressive way of life.

China is diverting much of its resources and its top talent to the building of a war machine, he charged.

"This is why the United States is fighting in Vietnam," he said. "If you control Vietnam you control Cambodia, you are just a short distance away from Manila, literally from every other place in the Pacific."

Mr. Callegary, a school dropout at 13 who later earned a law degree without graduation from high school or college, said he went to Vietnam to fulfill a pledge made when he became DAV commander, to see for himself how the wounded are being treated.

In addition, he said, "after becoming interested in the idea * * * I realized that in just going to Vietnam I would not really be getting answers to the question I am being asked continually: "Why are we there?"

The briefing schedule followed, he said, "and by the time I got to Saigon I was well briefed on why the United States is in Vietnam and why it is so important; why we have suddenly made this tremendous military commitment there."

He said the war begins to come home to the visitor when the incoming airliner approaches the airport at Saigon in a spiral path intended to keep it over the city and away from snipers.

"Most people don't realize—I didn't realize it—that much of this area is under constant attack by the Vietcong."

He said there were electric lights in his hotel only intermittently because the Vietcong had cut the powerlines. Artillery, machinegun and mortar fire frequently could be heard by persons inside the city and aircraft could be seen dropping flares at night to illuminate the area to keep the Vietcong from infiltrating.

"At some time during the day or night the B-52's would start dropping their bombs in an area 40 or 50 miles outside Saigon, making quite a bit of noise, doing a bit of damage, shaking windows," he recalled.

"To the Vietnam people this is a way of life, but to the visitor it is disconcerting."

The top man in DAV, which has its national headquarters in Cincinnati, also had observations about—

Congressmen and Senators touring Vietnam: "Those I met there were just as interested as I was in getting the facts."

Understanding of the troops as to why they are there: "These people are better informed than we were. I think this is from seeing atrocities and fighting side by side with the Vietnamese and seeing their great devotion."

Reaction of the troops to antiwar demonstrations back home: "'What about those guys back home?' they would ask. It's a hard question to answer because there has been a lot of confusion about these protestors."

Integration: "One of the interesting things that I didn't see in World War II was integration. There has been a big change. Colored men fight side by side with white men. They definitely have proven themselves to be good soldiers."

"There's no holiday time in Vietnam," he said regarding the visiting Congressmen. "And when you went from one place to another they couldn't guarantee you'd come back."

He recalled one incident in which a truck convoy left the airbase at Da Nang, which he described as a fortress, and traveled only 5 miles before the lead vehicles were blown up.

The DAV leader said there is high regard among U.S. troops in Vietnam for statements of President Johnson on prosecution of the war and his promise that it will not become another Korea.

In the meantime, he declared, DAV will increase its efforts on behalf of wounded veterans whose number goes far beyond the organization's 2.5 million members.

"There is no better organization to handle them than the DAV," he said. "We know what their problems are."

Cooley Introduces War on Hunger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 12152, a bill establishing the legal basis and authority for a world war on hunger. This is a kind of war in which all Americans and millions of people around the world may join in common purpose. In view of the hope this legislation holds for hungry millions, and its direct relationship to the cause of peace, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the consent of the House, a press statement I issued upon introducing the bill describing its provisions and its purpose. The statement follows:

COOLEY INTRODUCES WORLD WAR ON HUNGER BILL

Legislation opening the way for a world war on hunger, through extension and expansion of America's food-for-peace program, was introduced in the House today by Representative HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Cooley bill (H.R. 12152) would authorize:

1. Deliberate use of the great agricultural production potential of the United States to help relieve hunger and malnutrition throughout the free world. Such relief no longer would be limited only to the distribution of U.S. surplus food and fiber.

2. Deliberate employment of the agricultural commodities exported under this program to assist and encourage other countries in solving their own food problems.

The legislation would authorize an increase of $1 billion a year over the next 5 years, including 1966, in the movement of food and fiber abroad under Public Law 480, the Food-for-Peace Act.

Under Public Law 480 the United States has been exporting about $1.6 billion a year of agricultural commodities, but such shipments have been limited to those commodities which were officially declared to be surplus under domestic farm programs designed to reduce the production of various crops.

"In the legislation I am offering," Mr. COOLEY said, "in order to undertake a world war-on-hunger, we would not limit our exports for foreign currencies under Public Law 480, or our donations to relieve immediate famine and other emergency, to surpluses. We would make available under these authorities any agricultural commodity which we have in adequate supply and which is needed in the recipient countries—and if necessary our farmers will be asked to produce these commodities deliberately for such export purposes.

"In order to make this changed emphasis possible, the basic provision of my bill is to strike out of Public Law 480 the word 'surplus,' in connection with agricultural commodities, whenever it accurs. This will make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to program for concessional sale or for donation, where necessary, any agricultural commodity grown in the United States, whether it is technically in surplus or not, and to adjust production of that commodity so as to provide an adequate supply for all purposes."

Public Law 480, which expires this year unless renewed, provides for sale of U.S. surplus food and fiber for the local currencies of the recipient countries, where such sale does not interfere with established world commerce or normal trade in such commodities. It provides also for sale of such commodities for dollars under long-term contracts, for barter, and for donations to relieve famine and other emergency.

"The objectives I propose in a world war on hunger," Mr. COOLEY said, "do not require a new law nor a new agency. They require only a change in emphasis under the existing law, Public Law 480, and increased activity on the part of agencies and programs already in operation.

"I am immensely pleased and encouraged that the President, in his state of the Union message to the Congress on January 12, so eloquently stated these objectives I have proposed, in these words:

" 'This year I propose major new directions in our program of foreign assistance to help those countries who will help themselves. We will conduct a worldwide attack on the problems of hunger and disease and ignorance. We will place the matchless skill and the resources of our own great America in farming and in fertilizers at the service of those countries committed to develop a modern agriculture.' "

Mr. COOLEY declared:

"Our humanitarian instincts, the world population explosion, and the cause of peace, demand imaginative, sound and positive action at this time. The bill I have introduced today will be the vehicle for public hearings before the House Committee on Agriculture, exploring the whole area of food policy, as it relates to (1) human hunger and starvation now prevalent around the world, (2) to the worsening outlook inherent in the world population explosion, and (3) to the opportunities for improving the agricultural output of those nations where human needs are most acute.

"I expect the President at an early date to elaborate upon his state of the Union message, by sending to the Congress specific recommendations on world food and fiber policy. The President's suggestions, when they arrive, will be given first priority in the considerations by our committee.

"I personally am convinced that our world superiority in the production of food and fiber can be used to encourage great masses of humanity into peaceful pursuits, moving them toward self reliance and self sufficiency in the production of food and fiber. This should strengthen the bonds of friendship among free nations. Moreover, as I have said on many occasions, I am convinced that in the end bread will be more important than bullets in bringing peace to the world."

Mr. COOLEY said the new emphasis upon world food and fiber policy he envisions through the bill introduced today not only would aid the recipients of our food and fiber but also would be beneficial to the economy and well-being of the people of the United States.

"I am not proposing," he said, "that we remove forthwith the restraints upon farm production now operating through voluntary farm programs. If we did this, we might again find ourselves buried in surpluses. Neither do I suppose that the United States can feed everyone who is hungry around the world. But our farmers have mastered the arts of abundance and they can produce food and fiber, beyond our own needs, that can build the physical strength and morale of the populations in many countries where these people work in the direction of self-sufficiency in agriculture.

"The United States would expect to receive as great a return from its augmented exports of agricultural commodities as is reasonable and possible under the circumstances of each particular country.

"Food would be donated, where necessary if the country could pay for all or part of our exports in its local currency, it would be expected to do so. When its economy reached a level where it could pay in long-term dollar credits this would take the place of all or part of the local currency payments. From that it is to be hoped the country would develop into a commercial importer, as many of the countries which have received help under Public Law 480 have done.

"I expect this new emphasis I propose in the bill I have introduced to bring ultimately a substantial expansion of the production of America's farms, lessening the need for programs to repress production. Our farmers would be the key to the whole program I envision. I would hope that this new program would keep millions of acres in production and employ on our farms many thousands of people who would be dislocated and crowded into our cities if we proceed with further restrictions upon agricultural output.

"I can see that this new emphasis will develop for the United States broad commercial markets around the world for our food and fiber in the years ahead. Moreover, it has been demonstrated that those countries which have developed their agriculture to the highest degree are the best customers abroad of U.S. agriculture and industry."

National Police Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the office of the city clerk, city of Livonia, Mich., relative to a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Livonia, urging the establishment of a National Police Academy.

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
Livonia, Mich., December 27, 1965.

Hon. BILLIE S. FARNUM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FARNUM: The undersigned, Addison W. Bacon, city clerk of the city of Livonia, does hereby certify that at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Livonia, held on December 15, 1965, at 33001 Five Mile Road, Livonia Mich., at which time and place the following members of the council were present: Rudolph R. Kleinert, Peter A. Ventura, Edward H. McNamara, John F. Dooley, Edward G. Milligan, Charles J. Pinto, and James R. McCann; absent: none; the following resolution was duly made and adopted:

"RESOLUTION 1207–65

"*Resolved*, That the council does hereby request that the United States of America consider the establishment of a National Police Academy for the purpose of giving professional instruction and training to State and local police enforcement officers on a tuition basis so as to increase the effectiveness of police enforcement, the uniformity of same, all of which will tend to improve the image of law enforcement agencies throughout the country; and the city clerk is hereby requested to forward a certified copy of this resolution to U.S. Senators PHILIP A. HART and PATRICK V. MCNAMARA, to U.S. Congressman BILLIE S. FARNUM, and to U.S. Attorney General Nichalos Katzenbach."

The President declared the resolution adopted.

In witness whereof, the undersigned has hereunto affixed his signature on this 30th day of December, A.D. 1965.

ADDISON W. BACON, *City Clerk.*

A Great Society or a Good Society?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a Catholic layman, Mr. L. Brent Bozell, writing in the January 23 issue of "Our Sunday Visitor," the National Catholic Ecumenical Weekly, published in Huntington, W. Va., has drawn a sharp distinction between the so-called Great Society and what Mr. Bozell calls the Good Society. He also tells of the arrival of what some philosophers hail as the "post-Christian era."

While I am not of Mr. Bozell's church, Mr. Speaker, I commend him for his perceptive analysis of the trend our Government has been taking in recent years, and I join him in calling for a return to moral and ethical values—from which we have digressed so far—which were the guidelines of those who drew up our Federal Constitution.

Mr. Bozell's article follows:

GOOD SOCIETY: THE POST-CHRISTIAN ERA

It is said—how truly, I have no idea—that many persons cast their presidential ballots in 1960 primarily with a view to assuring to Catholics the status of "first-class" citizens. If that designation implies that a Catholic's influence on the American political order was thenceforth to be equal to that of any other citizen, there are some signs that the ambition has been realized. The late President, whose stature in the eyes of his countrymen seems to increase with each day since his assassination, was a Catholic; the Speaker of the House of Representatives is a Catholic; the majority leader of the Senate is a Catholic; recently the incumbent President met in New York with the Roman pontiff on terms of mutual respect, even reverence.

These developments have not, however, brought much satisfaction to me; and I question whether they are really a relevant measure of political influence. I think a meaningful inquiry into a man's, or in this case, a group's, "influence" on society would have to proceed along these lines: To what extent is the group's understanding of what the civil order should be and do (a) actually reflected in the day-to-day life of the society, or at least (b) acknowledged as the ideal and goal toward which the society purposively aspires? By this test, contemporary American society is frightfully un-Catholic; indeed, is anti-Catholic in its bottom-most dimensions—and is becoming more so every day. So far have things gone that the demise of Christian order has become in our time an occasion for public celebration: by philosophers, who hail the arrival of a "post-Christian era"; and implicitly by politicians, who agitate the Great Society.

ALARMING TENDENCIES

The last think I mean to suggest by this is that President Johnson and his supporters are morally censurable, in some sense in which his political opponents are not. President Johnson is a man of his age, and while the Johnson administration has furnished a rhetoric and certain dogmatic overtones that were unknown to its predecessors, these are not emphases that a slightly postdated Eisenhower administration would find uncongenial.

Nor does the indictment imply a moral judgment against the concrete political programs associated with the Great Society—medicare, the antipoverty war, and so on. Indeed, one of the most alarming tendencies of our time, all too frequently indulged by exponents of the Great Society, is to make political disagreements the basis of a moral sentence—to remove political issues, as Prof. Gerhart Niemeyer of Notre Dame has put it, "from the realm of prudence to that of righteousness." It is not a practice that critics of the Great Society should imitate.

What is wrong with the Great Society is its vision—its own understanding, as contrasted with Christianity's, of what the civil order should be and do. But note that this vision is more a matter of tendency than of doctrine. It is revealed partly by the attitudes and behavior which the Great Society either explicitly fosters or implicitly condones, and partly by its recognizable indifference to the superior claims of another set of attitudes and behavior. It emerges from such minutiae as that when political slogans were being thought up for communicating the vision—and to be fair let us remember that slogans are devised less to please the sellers than the buyers—the phrase that found favor was the "Great Society," not the "Good Society."

There is much traditional wisdom regarding the configurations of the Good Society, which for Catholics is another name for the Christian order. To recall a few of these, and to view in their light some of the values and practices that flourish in our country today, may be a useful way of grasping the tendency of the Great Society.

1. The good society, above all else, is God-oriented. Its institutions, its public life, its norms for private behavior—all are illuminated by the divine order, and subordinated to its requirements. No serious commentator would dream of describing modern American society in this fashion, either as it is, or as its present leaders are urging it to become. The ascendancy of the secular city is everywhere acknowledged, regretfully by a few, but triumphantly by many, not excluding, incidentally, some of the most influential Catholic intellectuals.

2. The good society facilitates personal virtue. Government itself will act sparingly in this area, but there are matters in which it can help other institutions foster conditions conducive to virtue. It will find ways, for instance, to clear the society's newsstands and movie houses of virulent obscenity, and if its highest Court is unable to distinguish between commercial prurience and the legitimate demands of freedom, its political branches will not supinely indulge the outrage.

3. The good society honors and fosters the family as the keystone of the social order. Here again its public authorities will recognize some responsibilities. They will not treat marriage as a contract less momentous than an agreement to buy a car. And another example: they will take care lest schools and welfare programs usurp family functions, and in so doing dissolve those natural bonds of obligation that are essential to the integrity of the family.

4. It promotes Christian education. A society that enforces a compulsory school system (and tends to worship at its altar), and at the same time systematically excludes God and His Truth from the classroom—such a society may become "great" in a futile, pagan sense; but it can never be good.

5. The good society insists upon the principle of the limited state. Legitimate political power is not sovereign; like any other aspect of the temporal order, it is answerable to the quite numerous constraints of the moral law. I do not recall when an authoritative spokesman for the Great Society has paused to make the point that there are some things that Government, in the very nature of things, can never do.

ENGINE OF CONSOLIDATION

6. The good society rigorously enforces the principle of subsidiary. It will not tolerate a higher level of government doing what a lower level, or private institutions, can do as well or better. The Great Society, by contrast, is an engine of consolidation. Far from recognizing the self-aggrandizing tendencies of power—far from seeking to diffuse power, and to maintain effective barriers against its accumulation—the Great Society has become synonymous with the idea that no "problem" is too insignificant to be denied the attention of the Federal Government, and, should the White House deem the moment ripe for intervention, its ministrations.

7. The good society seeks to maximize personal freedom. While it does not accord absolute value to freedom, the good society is concerned lest the various expressions of individual freedom be stifled by collectives—by bigness. The proponents of the Great Society have so far displayed little interest in restraining the suffocating embrace of big business, big labor, big education, big science, to say nothing further of big Government.

8. The good society promotes, insofar as is practicable, authentic self-government. It will therefore respect the spirit, as well as the letter, of the constitutional forms through which the society has chosen to register an authentic expression of the people's will. It deplores that parody of self-government that relies upon "consensuses" which are proclaimed from above, and to which the people, following the proclamation, are asked to conform.

9. It respects the principle of hierarchy, alike in the political and social orders. While the good society abhors hierarchical structures founded on false distinctions, such as race, it knows that no society based on doctrinaire equalitarianism can support a civilization, or do justice to the manifold and marvelous inequalities inherent in the human condition.

10. The good society enjoys civil peace. It can tolerate a certain amount of disorder—the usual depredations by criminal types, an occasional riot, a disruptive "demonstration." But when disorder has become characteristic of the society, when the streets of its cities, even its country lanes, can no longer be passed safely in the night, it has lapsed into a neobarbarism which is far more ominous for having emerged at an advanced rather than at an early stage of civilization. The custodians of the Great Society are by no means insensitive to the problem; but the problem reflects a core sickness which the Great Society's secular premises appear to have placed beyond the possibility of diagnosis and cure.

TECHNOLOGY'S PRISONER

11. Just as the good society subordinates man's concerns to those of God, just so it subordinates the artifacts of man to man. Technology, in the nature of things, is the servant of man. Yet in our time it is commonplace (though no less true for that) that man has become the servant of technology. And the Great Society's response is to breed more and better technicians. For the Great Society is also technology's prisoner, in spite of all its pretensions; and it may well be remembered by history as the society that could think of no better excuse for spending $20 billion to go to the moon than that it knew how.

12. The good society does not presume. And so its efforts on behalf of the common good are always conducted with an eye to the limitations of the human condition. The good society is concerned with reducing poverty and disease and ignorance and ugliness and unhappiness. But it does not hold forth the prospect of "eliminating" such conditions from the human experience; it does not offer itself as an antidote to the Fall. Prof. Nils Brodin of the University of California has written of the student agitators on the Berkeley campus: "these young rebels have sought to * * * replace their cognition of the transcendence of God with a kind of immanence of meliorism inherent in man. This, the perfectability of man, is the cardinal error in their premise and constitutes the essentially anti-Christian propensity of their message." But if the students understand themselves to be "rebelling" on these grounds, I cannot imagine why, or against whom. For anyone who has listened attentively to the high priests of the Great Society will have recognized precisely this "propensity" in their message, and will thus have learned why contemporary philosophers can speak as confidently as they do of a "post-Christian era."

Mickey Burnim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Dallas Morning News for Monday, January 17, written by Mr. Thomas Turner.

Teague, Tex., has little more than 2,500 population but is the largest town in Freestone County. It is stories of this type which do not reach the headlines of the large papers as a general rule, but a story which needs to be read by more people than just the people of Teague.

Mickey Burnim is a scholar and an athlete, and as a result of popular vote of his classmates, is their leader.

Negro Heads Senior Class at Teague High School

(By Thomas E. Turner)

Teague, Tex.—The president of the senior class at Teague High School is a smart young man, naturally. An honor-roll student.

He's a good athlete, naturally. Quarterback of the team until he dislocated a shoulder.

He's quiet, but articulate, naturally. Even if he is probably the youngest member of his class.

He's Mickey Burnim, 17 years old as of Wednesday, January 19. He's a Negro, which is certainly out of the ordinary around Teague High School.

Teague is a blackland town with a strong Old South flavor. With slightly more than 2,800 citizens it is the largest town in Freestone County. Just west of the Trinity River, it's a fringe of central east Texas.

It started integration last September by transferring the whole senior class of the Negro high school, Booker T. Washington, to traditionally all-white Teague High School. One of the 30 Negro students who made the historic move was 16-year-old Mickey Burnim.

The first week of school at Teague High School all the seniors met to elect a president. There were about four candidates nominated, including some of the city's most popular and well-to-do white youths. Mickey Burnim was surprised when he was nominated. The senior class has 75 members.

"I was certainly more surprised when I was elected," he recalls solemnly. "I could hardly have been more surprised by anything."

While the first integration moves have gone very smoothly in Teague it must have jarred some of the community when the news of Mickey's election was spread. If so, it never caused any trouble.

Says Mickey, "Everybody has been just wonderful. They have treated me as nice as can be. No trouble of any kind. I could not have been better treated."

He attributed much of that happy situation to football. Since the entire Negro senior class was moved to Teague High School, many football players were involved. At times the Teague High School Lions had nine Negro players on the field at once.

The quarterback, through the first five games, was Mickey. He was injured in the sixth game, against Marlin, and was out for the remainder of the schedule.

His father, Arzo Burnim, was head basketball coach and a football assistant coach at Booker T. Washington when the integration move was made. He now is an assistant football coach at Teague High School and its first full-time Negro teacher. Mrs. Burnim is also a teacher. They have a daughter in junior high and one in elementary school.

Mickey is an honor student in economics. He plans to attend Stephen F. Austin State College at Nacogdoches and major in international economics. He'd like a governmental career in that field.

Bill Hancock, Teague High School principal, says, "Mickey is certainly one of our best students. He has been completely accepted as such, with no extra problem."

It's a story not known outside of Teague. It isn't the kind that spawns headlines these days.

Administration Doing Masterful Job Withholding Information From the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's request for a supplemental appropriation of more than $12 billion for emergency financing of the war in Vietnam is evidence that the administration is doing a masterful job of figure juggling in withholding information from the American people.

The request for these essential, urgently needed funds was deliberately delayed until all the Great Society programs had been fully funded in the last session. Now we are handed the bill for our defense efforts, knowing it cannot be reduced.

The President's request for a speed-up in tax collections in this election year is another example of his figure juggling. Corporate and personal income tax collections would be accelerated, self-employed individuals would be asked to pay Social Security taxes on a quarterly basis rather than annually as at present, which would thus provide an immediate increase in revenue and make the fiscal picture temporarily appear brighter.

As the Twig Is Bent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have read with much interest an article, "As the Twig Is Bent," by Col. Harry C. Archer, U.S. Army, which appears in the February issue of the magazine, Together, and I feel that it will prove equally interesting to my colleagues. I submit for reprinting in the Congressional Record Colonel Archer's article, which follows:

As the Twig Is Bent

(By Harry C. Archer, colonel, U.S. Army)

Strange names once again are spreading across American headlines and creeping into the American vocabulary: Da Nang, Vietcong, and the Ho Chi Minh Trail. They are familiar because tens of thousands of our soldiers, airmen, and Marines are pouring into beleagured Vietnam. The buildup of combat forces there has brought increased draft calls and may lead to the mobilization of Reserve and National Guard units.

The demands of national security made upon the young men of our Nation are of obvious and direct concern to parents, clergymen, civic leaders—indeed to all Americans.

The first thought, of course, is for the physical safety and well-being of these lads. No less important is the concern over the effects of military service upon their moral fiber. Will they be coarsened and corrupted? Or will they emerge as self-reliant, better citizens?

As a soldier, a Regular Army officer, I have my own views. To illustrate, let me present an imagined but not unbelievable case:

The young soldier was not particularly drunk when he left the cafe. Just happy. He had had only a few beers. The girl lounging outside strolled up to him and struck a provocative pose. They chatted a few moments and then, with a shrug, the boy nodded and together they set off down the dimly lit street. Ten minutes later he was dead. They had not meant to kill him, just rob him. But there had been a scuffle, and now the soldier was very, very dead, lying in a foul-smelling alley thousands of miles from home and family.

Would such an incident have happened if the boy had not been drafted into military service? Of course that particular incident would not have occurred, but what about one like it? Would he have been as likely to drift off in an alcoholic haze with some other such girl? Was there, perhaps, some flaw in his character from earlier days, or did the Army cause him to follow this path?

After all, everyone who has read "From Here to Eternity," knows what the military services are like—sex-crazed, hard-drinking, profane, and completely controlled by sadistic sergeants and incompetent officers. Such an environment is bound to corrupt.

Balderdash. Let me lay it on the line for you, parents of America. With but a few exceptions, the boy coming out of the military is the same basic product that you created. So you want a good, clean kid to come home from the Army? It is easy. Just put a good, clean kid into the Army.

I am not being flippant. I have been in the Army more than 20 years, and I have seen the American serviceman at work and at play in the United States and in nearly 30 foreign lands. Some of them started using narcotics while others started building an orphanage. One man dealt in stolen black-market goods, and the Army dealt him a dishonorable discharge. Another from the same platoon attended night school, receiving a high school diploma with his honorable discharge.

What made the difference? They were in the same army. Could the difference lie in the moral training they received before they came into the service? If it were not so trite, I would answer my own question with that old chestnut about "As the twig is bent." On second thought, I'll say it anyway. As the twig is bent, so grows the tree, and you had better believe it.

FOUR KEY FACTORS

In the military, there appear to be four main factors that determine whether a twig will bend or grow straight—factors that determine how each young man will respond to the challenges of military life. It should come as no surprise that all four are directly connected with the home and community from which he came. The things which shape a lad's early life also tend to shape his career in uniform.

Here are the four factors:

Religion: The truly devout soldier is rarely in trouble. Even those who have relaxed somewhat in their church attendance are good risks if they have a background of sound Christian or Jewish training. Respect for the laws of God and man, as taught by the religious faiths, is the firmest foundation upon which to build a good soldier and a good citizen. The boys who take part in church activities and who have learned to seek their chaplain's guidance seldom see the inside of a military police station.

Family: The products of unhappy or broken homes have some tendency to have unhappy, broken military careers. I do not mean that such a boy is an odds-on favorite to be a troublemaker. The vast majority of all soldiers serve honorably and well. Only a small handful are given dishonorable discharges. I simply mean that a boy who grew up with the love and guidance of two well-adjusted parents has a better chance of a satisfying career.

Education: The better the education, the better the soldier. There is a direct, almost invariable, connection. The reasons are easily understood.

First, the well-educated soldier is assigned to better, more interesting duties. Often he is selected to attend highly technical schools which not only qualify him for promotion and better assignments but also prepare him for good jobs in civilian life. The educated soldier knows that receiving such opportunities depends in part upon his personal conduct.

Second, the better schooled soldier has a clearer understanding of why he is in the Army, why there must be a draft. If he is stationed in Europe, for example, he has some knowledge of American foreign policy and of why our Government believes that U.S. forces must be maintained there. Knowing these things, he has a sense of purpose and accomplishment that is not fully shared by his less fortunate fellows.

Last, he tends to associate with other well-educated soldiers. As a group, they are the ones most frequently seen in the post library, the chapel, the education center, and the craft shop—and more rarely seen in the nightclubs and bars that spawn disciplinary problems.

The Girl Friend: If a boy has won the love or affection of a girl back home, he is more likely to be a good soldier. If they are engaged, this influence is even stronger. A picture in the wallet, letters ending with little X's and O's—these are forces which never should be underestimated. The boy who wants a particular girl to be proud of him knows she will not be proud if his service is dishonorable. The lad in love is more apt to be economy minded. He saves his money for their future home, for gifts, or to squire the girl around when he returns home on leave. Such a soldier will spend less money, hence less time, in the cabarets that frequently cluster about military installations.

The letters from this all-important girl are a factor in themselves. If they are affectionate and chatty, speaking of familiar places and people, they are a strong link with all the more wholesome, desirable things in his life.

This matter of love is a double-edged sword, however. If the girl spurns him or turns to another, strange forces are sometimes loosened. While one boy might sit in his barracks to brood over his fate, another may embark upon a wave of rashness, turning to the consolation of alcohol or the arms of some other, too readily available girl. Which course he follows is determined by the other factors of religious training, homelife, and education.

Note that I have not mentioned such things as the soldier's race, social, or economic position, his national origin, or rural versus urban background. Perhaps statistical study would reveal that some of these are important, but in my experience they are not. Give me a religious, educated boy from a happy home with a wholesome girl in his heart, and I have a good soldier. I do not care if he is black, white, or purple, rich or poor; he will serve honorably and well and will return to his community as a good man and a good citizen.

FEAR OF CORRUPT INFLUENCES

Why do so many people fear the effects of military service on their sons or relatives? To my mind, the reasons are clear. In the first place, there are the newspaper headlines: "Soldier Rapes Teenager"; "Five Marines Killed in 100-M.P.H. Police Chase." How often do you see headlines blaring, "Salesman Robs Bank" or "Busdriver Slays Rival"? Rarely. And it is not because all salesmen and all busdrivers are above reproach.

Exceptions are made, of course, when a civilian's crime is completely inconsistent with his occupation: "Choir Director Arrested in Opium Den" or "Bank President Charged With Shoplifting." As a rule, however, civil occupations are not headlined.

Why the difference? I believe it is because of the uniform. It provides a visible identity found in few other occupations. Policemen also wear uniforms, and I can well picture a headline proclaiming, "Policeman Slays Wife," but I cannot imagine one announcing, "Grocer Killed in Three-Car Accident." In short, I believe the headlines give a grossly distorted picture of the serviceman's standard of conduct.

There is a second, more concrete reason for parents to fear the corrupting influence of military life. After all, Jimmy did not smoke or use swear words before he went into the Army, and now he does both. Proof positive. Well, what would have happened to Jimmy if, instead of entering the Army, he had left home for the first time to attend some large university or to work for a construction company? Would he then have been less likely to smoke and say dammit? No matter where he goes, a lad will pick up superficial signs of toughness when he goes out into the world of men. I do not believe military life is any worse or any better in this regard than a thousand other occupations.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE MILITARY

It may appear that I wish to absolve the military services of any responsibility for the conduct of our citizen-soldiers. That is not my desire nor is it the desire of any officer I know. The service branches have a deep feeling of obligation to do their share in preserving and further developing the moral stamina of their men. The reasons are both idealistic and practical.

On the idealistic side, we in the services do not regard ourselves as being basically separate or different from the rest of the American community. As children, we, too, played marbles, went fishing, came home with bloody noses, and loved the smell of burning leaves. Putting on a uniform did not mean that we suddenly became indifferent to all but the military aspects of American life. We are citizens as well as soldiers, and we feel civic as well as military obligations.

To insure the protection of our Nation, the President and the Congress have found it necessary to entrust a large number of American youth into our hands. We would be betraying that trust if we were indifferent to the moral, spiritual, and civic development of these young men. A great deal of time and effort goes into meeting those obligations.

Practical considerations lead to the same conclusion. From a purely military standpoint, we want men of strong moral character—for many reasons. The Army has found that the good citizen, with all that that implies, makes the better soldier. Of course there are some men without fear of God or love of man who also make good fighters. But military leaders prefer the soldier who is trained, educated, knows why he is fighting, and is convinced of the justice of his cause. Another, not inconsequential consideration, is the fact that the trained, disciplined soldier has a much better chance of survival. He lives to fight another day. This is not only a matter of concern to the individual soldier but also to his commander, who knows that one man with one weapon may spell the difference between defeat and victory.

Again, from a purely practical standpoint, it takes literally thousands of dollars to take a raw recruit and change him into a trained soldier. Our military and civilian superiors demand that we get the best in military posture out of each dollar provided by the taxpayers. We do not want that expensive soldier to spend one single hour in confinement.

At the relatively small post where I now am stationed are two chapels, a library, three clubs, a craft shop, an education center, a post exchange, a gymnasium, skeet shooting and golf driving ranges, a bowling alley, a theater, and a baseball diamond. Why all this? It is to give each soldier wholesome outlets for his spare time to attract him to stay on post rather than to seek outside diversions.

These facilities, by themselves, would not accomplish the purpose. There must be the human touch. From the time an inductee enters the Army until he leaves, there is frequent counseling and guidance by his unit commander, chaplain, and senior noncommissioned officers. There are regularly scheduled training periods for character development, lectures on social diseases, and discussions of world events and national policies. My battalion commanders (lieutenant colonels) personally speak at least once a month to every man in their command about standards of conduct. Their company commanders do the same once a week.

The Army commander in my area, a four-star general, has made it abundantly clear to all his subordinates that he considers control of the soldiers' conduct, both on duty and off, one of the big indications of a commander's competence.

In times past, I can recall occasions when the armed services have been forced to take positions that ran counter to the social and economic desires of the civilian community. Young men have been taken from their homes and jobs to serve in uniform. Nike missile sites have been built on land needed for other facilities. Tax funds which might have built schools and roads have been diverted to buy planes, tanks, and ships. In today's world, these things are unfortunate but unavoidable.

But on the matter of the moral fiber of America's young men, there is no conflict of military and civilian aims. We in the military hope to obtain decent, intelligent, civic-minded youths to serve with those of us who have chosen a career in uniform. We hope to return them to their homes changed, if at all, for the better.

President Asks U.S. Part in Asian Development Bank as Another Constructive Effort Toward Lasting World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is highly significant that President Johnson chose to make his first special message to this session of Congress a request for approval of U.S. participation in the newly created Asian Development Bank.

It is significant in my opinion because it indicates the top priority that the President places on the search for peace, and his desire to demonstrate again that the United States would much rather spend money and exert our energies on peaceful economic development than on the requirements of military defense.

Californians, both for historic and geographic reasons, fully understand and appreciate the President's desire that America play an important leadership role in promoting the cause of international cooperation and in building the foundations for peace among the nations of the world.

Located as we are on the shore of the great Pacific Ocean, and with many of our citizens having close family ties with the people of other Pacific nations, we Californians have an immediate and personal interest in establishing good, constructive relations with our neighbors in the Pacific community and in doing our full part to promote their best interests.

But all Americans can agree with President Johnson when he spoke of his "urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world."

And certainly no one would challenge the truth of the President's statement that—

> An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease, and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within.

But Congress, by acting promptly to approve our active participation in the Asian Development Bank, can help express "the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times."

In his eloquent message, President Johnson described the Bank as "an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States." He continued:

> For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet.

Recalling his speech last April in Baltimore, the President spoke again of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope," and he repeated his promise that "we will help to make it so."

In urging the Congress to adopt his proposal, Mr. Johnson declared:

> Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House and Senate act without delay to endorse American participation in this new self-help development effort—this unique adventure in international cooperation.

Sixty-five percent of the Bank's $1 billion capital is to be put up by 19 Asian countries, and the rest by the United States, Canada, Belguim, Denmark, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Britain.

The $200 million U.S. share is equal to that of Japan—the other largest single contributor.

In my opinion, the establishment of this Bank is an important step, because it will help create a nucleus around which Asian cooperation can grow. And it will follow in the successful footsteps of the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the recently formed African Development Bank.

We must not fail to take advantage of this golden opportunity to unite our resources with the people of Asia in a common effort to achieve those goals which are the dream of all mankind.

Because of its importance, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of President Johnson's special message to Congress on behalf of U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

The message follows:

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 361)

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress promptly approve U.S. participation in the Asian Development Bank.

This new institution expresses the will of Asia to develop her manifold human and natural resources, and thereby to lift the burden of poverty that has been the lot of her people since ancient times.

Conceived and sponsored by Asians, the Bank is open to all countries in that region, regardless of ideology, who are members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies. Of its $1 billion authorized capital, 65 percent is to be subscribed by nations in the Asian area.

U.S. representatives—led by Mr. Eugene Black and a distinguished congressional delegation—signed the Charter of the Asian Development Bank at Manila last December 4. But only the Congress itself can authorize the final acceptance of U.S. membership.

That is the action I request today.

I

I take this step because of my urgent belief that the works of peace in Asia—the building of roads, dams, harbors, powerplants, and all the other public and private facilities essential to a modern economy—are vital to peace in the entire world.

An Asia torn by conflict, depressed by hunger, disease, and illiteracy, deprived of the means and the institutions that alone can offer hope to her people, must ever be a source of turmoil and anxiety for nations beyond her borders, as well as those within. Because this is so—and because we have recognized our moral obligation to our brothers on this earth—the United States has committed itself over a decade and a half to major assistance programs in Asia, making food, development loans, and technical assistance available to those who required our aid.

We have sought no American empire. Our purpose has never been to exploit, but to encourage; not to master, but to magnify the works of those who truly served the Asian people.

Now the Asians themselves have formed an institution by whose hand new works of peace may be accomplished. They have committed precious resources to that institution. They are determined to join in a cooperative endeavor, uniting the talents and resources of diverse cultures in pursuit of a common vision of progress.

They have asked us to join with them—to subscribe 20 percent of the institution's total capital—and thus to help make that vision a reality.

I recommend that we respond quickly and affirmatively.

II

This proposal is neither utopian nor vague. It is the product of careful deliberation by the foremost experts in international finance. It rests solidly on the lessons learned in building the World Bank, and other organs of international finance, into the powerful forces for good they are today. It will take its place among regional financial institutions alongside the Inter-American Development Bank and the newly formed African Development Bank.

Loan terms will be similar to those offered by the World Bank. Project justifications will be as rigorous as prudent management requires. Special efforts will be made to develop and finance projects involving more than one country so that the Bank may be an agent of unity as well as development.

The Bank will reinforce existing aid programs in Asia, and thereby multiply their effectiveness. It will link its resources—financial and human—to such institutions as the Mekong Coordinating Committee, already joining the countries of the Mekong River Basin in major water resource projects.

Its charter permits it to administer special development funds, contributed by either member or nonmember countries. Thus it will serve as a channel for funds beyond its own resources.

These advantages are developed further in the Special Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the Asian Development Bank which accompanies this message.

III

The largest share of the Bank's subscriptions will be provided by Asians themselves.

The United States has been asked to pledge $200 million, equally divided between paid-in and callable shares. The paid-in shares are payable in five equal annual installments of $20 million each, half of which will be in cash, half in the form of a letter of credit.

The callable shares will constitute a guarantee for borrowings by the Bank in private capital markets. They would be drawn on only in the unlikely event that the Bank were unable to meet its commitments.

Our pledge is equaled by that of Japan. India has pledged $93 million; Australia another $85 million. More than $100 million has already been pledged by European countries and Canada, and further pledges may be made.

Joint action with these major subscribers provides another instrument of cooperation between the donors of aid. That is a long-sought goal of the United States, for it offers the most efficient use of all the free world's aid resources.

Finally, our commitment to the Asian Bank should have little negative effect on our balance of payments. Procurement financed through the Bank's regular capital will normally be limited to member countries. Purchases of U.S. goods and services will approximately offset the dollar outflow occasioned by our $10 million annual cash subscription.

IV

The Asian Development Bank is a necessity—not a luxury.

It was needed yesterday. It is needed even more today. Tomorrow, when the demands of Asia's millions on her struggling economies are more pressing still, it can mean the difference between opportunity and chaos.

It is practical and imaginative. It is the product of Asian initiative, and it offers the nucleus around which Asians can make a cooperative response to the most critical economic problems—national and regional.

Because it is all these things, it is also an avenue of good will and sound policy for the United States. For our destination is a world where the instinct for oppression has been vanquished in the heart of man. Given the means to work, to build, to teach, to heal, to nourish his family, man may yet achieve such a world—if not in our time, then in the generations that will succeed us on this planet. I believe the Asian Development Bank is an essential tool in providing the means of life for hundreds of millions of human beings who live between the Caspian Sea and the South Pacific.

It will become a reality when 15 signatories, 10 of them Asian, have ratified the charter. It appears now that this will be achieved by early spring. Our own constructive influence in the organization and management of the Bank will be increased if we can become active at its very beginning.

Last April in Baltimore I spoke of our dream of a world "where all are fed and charged with hope." I promised that "we will help to make it so." Our partnership in the Asian Bank is a step in keeping that pledge. It brings us nearer that day when our resources—and the world's—can be devoted to the constructive works of peace, not the destructive forces of war.

I urge the Congress to adopt the Asian Development Bank Act. Asia's future—and the world's—requires it.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 18, 1966.*

Pratt & Whitney Celebrates 40th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, one of the great industrial enterprises in Connecticut, the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division of United Aircraft, recently celebrated its 40th anniversary. First established in 1925, this company has become a great leader in American industry over these past 40 years and has helped our country in its defenses. It employs about 70,000 people and over the years has had a tremendous impact for the good of the Connecticut economy.

I wish to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to Pratt & Whitney, its very able and progressive industrial leaders, and all its employees for their success and achievements. The State of Connecticut is very proud that this firm had chosen our State as its home, and we are providing it with the necessary skilled help needed for a great enterprise of this kind.

In connection with this anniversary, the company published a journal containing reprints of articles from Connecticut newspapers commemorating the anniversary. I have selected two of these for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: one, describing a tour of the Pratt & Whitney plant in East Hartford, written by Mildred Zaiman; the other, describing the company's Washington office and its activities, written by William A. Garrett. They are as follows:

MAGIC MACHINES: PLANT TOUR AN EYE-OPENER TO LAYMAN

(By Mildred Zaiman)

I took a guided tour of the Pratt & Whitney aircraft plant in East Hartford and saw some amazing machines.

I saw computer-fed machines which are told what to do by tape.

I saw electrochemical machinery and electrodischarge machinery which perform precision work.

I saw the Zyglo test machine which has X-ray eyes to detect hidden imperfections in metal.

I saw the intricate electron beam welding apparatus which bombards pieces of metals into desired submission.

I saw the concrete-block test cells and heard the roar of powerful jet engines as they were subjected to rigorous tests.

I saw the might of Pratt & Whitney aircraft and in a nontechnical and nonmechanical fashion, learned about the jet engine power that leads the world.

Before admittance to the plant, I had to stop in an office manned by a crew of guards where I exchanged my visitor's badge for a higher level one—only after I had signed my name several times, and filled out a form which required information about my age, place of birth, and whom I was representing.

My guide eyed my high heels skeptically and said I'd never make it. The plant is nine-tenths of a mile long and the floor is pitted here and there with small apertures which might catch thin heels, he said. So he arranged for car service, and I was chauffeured in an electric buggy, one of two which are used for tour purposes.

The buggy resembled an overgrown golf cart with three rows of seats wide enough to seat three on each. A microphone was attached in the front for the benefit of back-seat passengers who might have difficulty hearing above the clack, roar, and grind of the machines.

TAPE-RUN MACHINE

The aisles were wide and uncluttered but we had to pull to the side several times to allow plant vehicles the right of way. There were all kinds. Most were bright yellow fork lift trucks dispatched by radio, which possessed two long fork-like prongs about 10 feet long by about a foot wide that protruded in the front on either side of the trucks. There was more conventional factory transportation and a lot of king-size tricycles with baskets hung on the rear for small stuff. There was one vehicle with treads like a tank.

The first machine we stopped to inspect was one operated by a computer. It was huge and though it was started and stopped by an operator, it responded to electrical commands issued by a tape. The company has about 100 of these machines, more than any other factory in the country.

A short ride away we came to electrochemical machinery and electrodischarge machinery. They must be quite complicated to the uninitiated because in one area nearby a sign said the machine removes metal "through the principles of electrolysis according to Farraday's law established 150 years ago. The law states that if direct current is applied to two pieces of conductive metal submerged in a suitable electrolyte, metal will be removed from one and deposited on the other."

I didn't question the explanation but assumed the machine did its delicate work with the aid of electricity.

The electrodischarge machine did finer work than the other. On one side was a bath of salt water used as a conductor, on the other, a silicone and oil mixture used for flushing and as protection against electric current going where it wasn't wanted.

About a quarter of a mile away we stopped briefly in front of a large rectangular machine which I was told was a Zyglo test machine. This was a "detective" and through a chemical and photographic process detected flaws in metals deep in their innards, hidden from ordinary inspection.

FUTURISTIC FUNNELS

Along the way there were hundreds of different kinds of machines, all whirring and clacking away, turning out intricate pieces of metals to fit into the larger scheme of things. I didn't know a tool from a die, but they were fascinating to watch. Some of the machines almost reached to the ceiling. Many had curiously twisted pipes and stacks bigger than the trunks of huge trees which spiraled up to the ceiling in a futuristic fashion. There were machines which moved on tracks, gigantic presses which could exert 500 to 3,000 tons of pressure to force metals into necessary shapes, there was a huge heat treating area, the largest in the country.

In a separate area I examined an electron beam welding machine used to subdue hard-to-weld metals. The electron beam operates in a lead-lined vacuum chamber and has a velocity of electrons of 102,000 miles per second. The single beam which shoots out from a small hole in the top-center of the machine can melt pure tungsten at 6,100 degrees. The machine is relatively new—1960 vintage.

JET ASSEMBLY LINE

We next rode into the assembly plant where the thousands of parts are put together to make the whole. It was a huge area, lined from one end to the other with jet engines of all sizes in various stages of assembly. Some of the engines were surrounded by elevators which went up as the engine grew so that it was accessible to workmen. All were on dollies for maneuverability. Some of the jets were in the initial stages of assembly where the low compressors were being installed and tested. Some were quarter-finished, some half-finished. And in one part of the plant there were about seven or eight giant jets ready to be tested. They were magnificent pieces of engine wizardry, awe-inspiring in their naked exhibition of harnessed power.

The last stop was at the shipping area where the jets were wrapped in heavy plastic covers for shipment by air to their destination. Engines not shipped by air, or not destined for immediate use, were placed in heavy, well-protected containers.

On our way back, we passed a room from which crackles of electricity came. The sign on the door said we were not allowed in without a No. 6 badge. Lacking the necessary credentials, it was left unobserved.

The buggy was parked. A plug was inserted to recharge its batteries. I again entered the guard room, turned over my plant admittance badge, reclaimed my visitor's badge, and left.

It was a fascinating look into the world of the mighty jets.

FIFTY-MAN STAFF KEEPS TABS ON CAPITAL

(By William A. Garrett)

WASHINGTON.—United Aircraft Corp.'s headquarters here has become an important part of the company's marketing operations since its establishment 3 years ago.

The headquarters at 1725 DeSales Street, across from the historic Mayflower Hotel, is bright and cheerful but conservatively furnished. Each United Aircraft division has its own set of offices there, so arranged as to provide easy and informal physical communications.

The corporation and its operating divisions and subsidiaries fill a floor and a half in a nine-story structure. Such divisions as Pratt & Whitney Aircraft, Hamilton Standard, and Sikorsky were scattered about the Nation's Capital for several years prior to their concentration under one roof.

With increasing defense and space spending, coupled with ever more complex Government procurement and contractual procedures, United Aircraft's offices here have been performing the dual functions of sales and information clearinghouse.

United Aircraft says the Washington headquarters is a microcosm, in many ways, of the corporate operations in Connecticut. Each division operates as a separate entity, reporting directly to its divisional home office.

The chief here is Joseph M. Barr, a vice president of United Aircraft, who provides general guidance, liaison and coordination. His staff is modest in comparison with other major space and defense firms maintaining offices here.

Mr. Barr has an assistant who also serves in a public relations capacity, a secretary who doubles as office manager, a secretary who doubles as security officer with control of the many classified (secret) documents handled in the office, a switchboard operator and a mail clerk.

Employees, including all in seven operating divisions, United Research Laboratories and United Aircraft International, number about 50.

The staff's Washington "beat" primarily takes in covering developments in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Defense Department, State Department, Commerce Department, and numerous lesser Federal agencies.

Besides, UAC says, frequent contact is kept with the Washington headquarters of such organizations as the National Security Industrial Association, the Aerospace Industries Association, and the Air Transport Association, and with offices here of such commercial customers as the Boeing Co., Douglas Aircraft Co., Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and North American Aviation.

"Of course," Mr. Barr points out, "we enjoy cordial relations with the congressional delegation from Connecticut and the other States in which we have operations, and there is an exchange of information of mutual interest.

"Other than that, however, our visits to Capitol Hill are confined to attendance as observers at congressional hearings dealing with aviation, space or defense subjects."

Mr. Barr explains that proposed legislation affecting the aerospace industry is the concern of trade associations such as NSIA and AIA and not of individual company representatives.

Because United Aircraft does an annual business of over $100 million in foreign sales, Washington is an important market link. All countries recognized by the U.S. Government have embassies here, providing a ready source of export information.

In addition, the city is visited frequently by trade delegations from foreign nations.

As one of America's top convention cities, Washington also is the backdrop for a steady stream of conferences, seminars and meetings on space, aviation and defense. Attending such sessions is a regular assignment for United Aircraft personnel.

A typical example was the Air Force Association's annual fall meeting in mid-September, featuring aerospace development briefings and displays, and an international aerospace education seminar. Here the Pratt & Whitney Aircraft TF30 engine, which powers the General Dynamics F-111 plane, was shown publicly for the first time.

Mr. Barr, who was president of United Aircraft International until he was promoted to vice president of the parent corporation, came to Washington with a broad background of marketing experience for the whole range of UAC products. UAI represents all operating divisions in foreign sales efforts so Mr. Barr was familiar to an unusual extent with the wide capabilities of the corporation's research, development and production facilities.

James A. Shinkoff, head of Hamilton Standard's Washington office, has the longest Washington service among UAC's divisional managers here. A former service representative for Hamilton, Mr. Shinkoff came here 15 years ago to set up a 1-man office.

The Washington representatives of all United Aircraft divisions have the challenging job of keeping abreast of developments in a world leaping ahead with scientific advances in the air, on the ground and under the sea.

Why Crime Is Less in Chicago?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial the Chicago Tribune today called the attention of the country to the magnificient work being performed daily by the men of the Chicago Police Department in protecting one of our largest cities.

Chicago today is setting the standard for police departments throughout America and the world.

Chicago's Mayor Richard J. Daley, deserves the gratitude of all Americans for the leadership and inspiration he has provided in helping to make Chicago a model American city. It was Mayor Daley who persuaded Orlando W. Wilson to bring his considerable talents to the task of supervising Chicago's enormous police department and Superintendent Wilson has been more than equal to the responsibility.

The men of the Chicago Police Department are men who serve our community with pride, with integrity and with a selflessness and a sense of duty which make them an example to law enforcement agencies everywhere. Under the leadership of Mayor Daley and Superintendent Wilson, they are demonstrating, capably and graphically, the tremendous strides which have been made in protecting the residents and property of Chicago.

We are proud of them, Mr. Speaker, and I call this editorial to my colleagues' attention today so that they may share this gratifying tribute. Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

WHY CRIME IS LESS IN CHICAGO

The quick arrest of 4 robbers who held up 18 passengers on an early morning rapid-transit train is a shining example of good police work. It shows why crime rates have not been increasing in Chicago as they have in almost all the other big cities.

The four robbers are young men, but all of them have police records and four of them have served terms in the Bridewell. The crime was carefully planned. Three of the men had loaded pistols and one had a lariat, which could have been used to tie up anyone who resisted. They boarded the train at different stations to avoid attracting attention and to make sure no policeman was aboard.

After robbing the passengers systematically and threatening to kill them, the robbers left the train and called a taxicab from a gasoline service station at Fullerton and Seminary Avenues. In the meantime the motorman of the train had notified a CTA dispatcher by telephone and the dispatcher had called police. By the time the robbers reached the gasoline station a dozen police squads were looking for them.

They might have escaped except for the alertness of the squad composed of Policemen Robert Dvorak and Ray Hanley, who regularly patrol the neighborhood. They have an arrangement with business places open at night to make an inspection if they fail to receive a prearranged all-clear signal.

When the squad passed the gasoline station the police team failed to get the signal. Suspecting the robbers were inside, they called for help and soon were joined by Policemen Eugene Elander and Kenneth Restis in another squad car. The robbers were arrested and disarmed before they knew what had happened to them, and a shooting match was avoided.

The credit for these arrests belongs to the four brave, hard-working policemen and to the expensive communications systems installed by Police Supt. O. W. Wilson and paid for by the taxpayers. Criminals in Chicago are now on notice that within a few minutes after a crime has been reported they are being hunted. The blue cars of the police are patroling the streets constantly. In some neighborhoods, citizens are rarely out of sight of a police car.

Chicago once had the reputation of being a capital city of all kinds of crime. A Chicagoan, crossing the border into Canada or registering at a European hotel, was likely to hear slurring comments about his city.

Times have changed. Other cities now send their police executives to Chicago to learn how an efficient police department works.

Reuther Raps TWU's Walkout

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, following my inclusion in the Record last week of a recommendation made by the editors of Newsday relative to the dangers of inflation and its relation to the wage and price dilemma facing us, I noted in the Long Island Press a report on a statement by Mr. Walter Reuther who had either seen the Newsday editorial or came to a similar conclusion independently. Both Newsday and Mr. Reuther seem to agree on the urgent need for establishment of a wage and price board. This is a suggestion we might well consider, and I respectfully ask permission to include the Long Island Press report of Mr. Reuther's remarks in the Record:

REUTHER RAPS TWU'S WALKOUT

DETROIT.—Walter P. Reuther came out yesterday against strikes in public service industries and deplored the recent New York City transit walkout.

"Society cannot tolerate strikes that endanger the very survival of society," Reuther said.

The United Auto Workers Union president, a leader of scores of strikes himself, proposed that machinery be set up in an effort to forestall strikes like New York's.

Reuther, in an appearance before the Economic Club of Detroit, proposed creation of a tripartite group representing management, labor and the public be set up for this purpose.

"I don't think we ought to have strikes in public service industries," he said, in describing his proposal in a news conference and his formal speech.

"We cannot live in a situation where a few workers who are denied their equity can paralyze an entire community," he said. "Workers should be able to get justice in the absence of strike action.

"I favor creating a mechanism which would make strike action obsolete in these industries."

Reuther also called for establishment of a price-wage review board to rule on both price increases as well as union demands. He said this could forestall strikes and act as a brake against inflation. The UAW has made the same proposal in past years.

Reuther said he did not know enough about the New York transit settlement to be able to comment on President Johnson's criticism of it as inflationary. He said, however, the settlement would have "no impact whatsoever" in other labor negotiations.

Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, among the issues considered by the United Nations General Assembly in its recent session, was a British resolution on the subject of procedures for peaceful settlement of international disputes.

The U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., Arthur Goldberg, made a statement in support of the resolution which is an excellent expression of U.S. policies and goals. I am inserting his remarks into the Congressional Record at this time so that my colleagues and other readers of the Record will have access to this statement.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE ON PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

I should like to begin by expressing our gratitude to the United Kingdom for placing on the agenda this item on the peaceful settlement of disputes.

We find it most appropriate that the United Kingdom should have taken this initiative. After all, the United Kingdom is the home of those concepts of due process of law which have been the firm foundation of the legal systems of many of us here, and the United Kingdom has played a leading role in the effort to bring the rule of law to the relations between States.

Some 45 years ago, for example, it was the United Kingdom which formally proposed the use of rapporteurs or conciliators in cases before the Council of the League of Nations. And some 15 years ago, it was the United Kingdom which proposed a procedure for conciliation in contentious questions before the United Nations.

The Government of the Netherlands, too, has made a major contribution by introducing its proposals on factfinding. This is but the latest in a series of constructive proposals by a country whose name has become synonomous with international law and peaceful settlement.

It is certainly fitting that we should turn to the question of peaceful settlement before the close of International Cooperation Year. In the view of my delegation, there is no more important subject on the agenda of this General Assembly.

In world affairs, as in domestic affairs, there can be no lasting peace without institutions for peaceful settlement and peaceful change. When these do not exist, nations, like individuals, will take matters into their own hands.

The peaceful settlement of disputes, therefore, is not a utopian dream. It is a practical necessity for the survival of mankind in the nuclear age. Unless man learns the art of peaceful settlement, his tenure on earth will be short indeed.

Peaceful settlement, in our view, is not only a requirement for survival. It is also, together with disarmament and peacekeeping, one of three interdependent elements of a decent world order.

History has demonstrated that nations will not be willing to disarm unless they have confidence that international disputes will be settled by peaceful means in accordance with justice and international law. This is why the United States made the strengthening of U.N. machinery for peaceful settlement a central element in our treaty outline for general and complete disarmament.

Progress in peaceful settlement is also essential to the success of this organization in containing violence through the use of United Nations peacekeeping forces.

In the last two decades the United Nations has learned to respond to peacekeeping emergencies by dispatching military observers, truce supervisors, and armed forces. Once a peacekeeping operation is established, however, there has been an unfortunate tendency to forget about the underlying problem which made the operation necessary in the first place.

The resulting situation was described for us by the Secretary General in his report issued last Friday on the U.N. operation in Cyprus.' (S/7001, Dec. 10, 1965.)

"It has become something of a pattern in United Nations peacekeeping operations," he said, "that although they are launched in the expectation that as emergency measures they will be of short duration, the harsh realities of the conflict situations in which they become involved quite often require them to be prolonged, more or less indefinitely."

And he added: "The Cyprus operation now tends to conform to this pattern."

Recent discussions in this committee and in the fifth committee have reflected the growing concern of members with the problem of financing peacekeeping operations. Many members do not want to bear these financial burdens. But how can such costs be reduced or eliminated, if we do not all take responsibility for solving the political problems which make peacekeeping operations necessary?

Clearly peacekeeping operations should not be a sofa to provide a comfortable respite from efforts at peaceful settlement—they should be a springboard for accelerated efforts to eliminate the root causes of conflict. And no less clearly, we must develop the same sense of urgency in dealing with the causes of conflict that we have demonstrated in the containment of conflict.

To quote the Secretary General once again:

"The Cyprus experience is by no means unique in this regard. The United Nations has learned from other experiences that time and even relative quiet alone do not necessarily in themselves induce or promote solutions of basic conflict situations.

"Persistent, determined effort is imperative on the part of the United Nations. But most of all, it is the parties themselves who have to show the necessary willingness to find an honorable and just solution."

In the view of my delegation, special and urgent efforts should be undertaken to attack the root causes of conflicts which have been temporarily arrested by the interposition of peacekeeping forces.

More should also be done through preventive diplomacy to anticipate and resolve situations which could lead to armed conflict. The burden on the U.N. fire department will become intolerable if we cannot do a better job of fire prevention.

Julius Nyerere, the distinguished President of Tanzania, has called on all of us to demonstrate what he so aptly describes as "the courage of reconciliation." The time has come to manifest that courage in the improvement of procedures for peaceful settlement and in the use of those procedures in concrete cases. After all, our organization was conceived as an instrument for the reconciliation of differences—not be merely as a forum in which they could manifest themselves.

Within our various countries, we have all seen the value of peaceful settlement procedures. These procedures can serve several purposes:

They can provide a "cooling off period" for the fever of controversy to subside.

They can help bring contending parties into touch with one another.

They can help find the facts.

They can help identify points of agreement.

They can introduce the calming effect of impartial judgment.

They can mobilize public opinion against excessive claims.

They can place responsibility on others for results for which the parties themselves could not accept responsibility.

In modern times, and particularly since the Hague Conferences of 1897 and 1907, enormous energy has been invested in the attempt to apply the arts of peaceful settlement to disputes between nations. As a result, there certainly is no lack of available machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes:

There are now some 300 treaties in force for the peaceful settlement of disputes through inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, or a combination of these methods.

There are now some 600 treaties in force which confer jurisdiction on the International Court of Justice to decide disputes as to their interpretation and application.

Most of these instruments for peaceful settlement have been concluded since the First World War. Many of them have been concluded since the Second World War.

It is tempting to conclude from these statistics that the international community is making great strides in the field. But the enormous increase in the institutions for peaceful settlement has not been accompanied by a similar increase in the actual resort to such institutions.

Does this mean that the renewed effort called for in the resolution now before us is doomed to failure? My delegation is not prepared to accept so pessimistic a conclusion. Indeed, we believe the resolution might spark a renaissance in the use of peaceful settlement procedures and thus be a step in the long road to a just and lasting peace.

We believe this resolution can serve this objective in at least three ways:

First, it can induce all of us to look again at our charter obligations to resort to peaceful settlement.

The charter of the United Nations, in article 1, paragraph 1, declares that one of the purposes of our organization is "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

It states in paragraph 4 of the same article, that the U.N. is intended to be "a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

It commits all members, in article 2, paragraph 3, "to settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

And it further commits all members in article 33, in regard to any disputes the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, "first of all" to "seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

These provisions are the great underdeveloped areas of the charter. They are underdeveloped because none of us—and I specifically include my own country—has done enough to implement our solemn obligations in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the work we are beginning here could help to recommit us all to the solemn obligations contained in these articles. And I would further suggest that it might also serve to impress us with one aspect of these obligations which is often overlooked and sometimes ignored.

It is quite clear that, while a dispute is still in a stage where it only threatens the maintenance of international peace, the parties are obliged to settle that dispute peacefully. But what happens if for any reason—whether through accident, miscalculation, or design—a dispute is not settled peacefully and the parties resort to force?

Quite clearly, when we look at the letter and spirit of the charter, we see that the obligation of peaceful settlement does not end once conflict has broken out. Rather—and I think this point is worth emphasizing—the duty to settle a dispute peacefully is an obligation which continues from the moment the dispute first develops right through to the time when it is finally settled—even though armed conflict may have broken out.

As far as the United States is concerned, I can reaffirm today our unconditional commitment to this obligation. We seek the peaceful settlement of every dispute to which we are a party everywhere in the world—and this commitment most specifically applies to those disputes which, tragically and against our will, are being dealt with on the battlefield rather than in the conference room where they truly belong.

Second, the resolution now before us can encourage us all to make greater use of the machinery for peaceful settlement which we already have.

The study called for in this resolution can serve to inform us of the rich resources for peaceful settlement now existing both inside and outside the United Nations system. It can also stimulate the greater use of these resources.

In the United Nations itself, we have developed many facilities for peaceful settlement. The Secretary General and his senior aids, as well as special United Nations mediators, have contributed to the cessation of hostilities or the achievement of political settlement in such farflung places as Indonesia, West New Guinea, Kashmir, and the Middle East.

We support the continued expansion of this work—and the continued implementation of those fundamental charter principles of the efficiency and impartiality of the Secretariat without which this work would not be possible.

We support the further development of the impressive resources for peaceful settlement which have been developed by the Specialized Agencies of the United Nations. I have in mind, for example, the procedures for enquiry and conciliation used by the International Labor Organization in the implementation of its members' commitments to fair labor standards; the methods employed by the International Telecommunication Union in resolving problems concerning the allocation of radio frequencies; and the techniques of arbitration and conciliation which the International Bank is just now making available for the settlement of investment disputes.

We also favor a substantial strengthening of the peaceful settlement procedures of regional agencies. Those of us who belong to regional organizations or who have observed their work know of the accomplishments in this field of the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of American States—and wish them to make further progress.

At the recent Rio Conference, my country, as well as others, put forth proposals for the further strengthening of OAS procedures in pacific settlement—and amendments to the OAS Charter will now be drafted with a view to strengthening these procedures.

While we place primary emphasis on institutions for third party settlement, we should not entirely ignore the resources available for bilateral settlement. For example, the United States has been participating with its immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada, in joint international commissions dealing with specific types of disputes arising in our bilateral relations.

We believe, finally, that greater use can and should be made of the International Court of Justice as an instrument for pacific settlement. We have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

It is true that we have made a reservation concerning disputes which are within our domestic jurisdiction.

Let me amphasize today that this reservation means exactly what it says. It does not relate to disputes on matters of international law. I can state categorically that my Government stands ready to take to the International Court any outstanding dispute on any matter of international law with any other country which, like ourselves, has accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

Third, the resolution now before us can lead to improvements in our existing institutions for pacific settlement.

We have no illusions that institutions alone can solve the problem. We recognize—indeed we insist—that the central problem is one of national attitudes. The most important requirement for peaceful settlement is the willingness of nations to abide by the law and settle their differences in accordance with law.

But it does not follow from this that institutions make no difference. It is our view that institutions do matter and that the existing procedures for peaceful settlement can be improved.

Therefore, we propose nothing less than the creation of a United Nations Peace Service—a flexible set of procedures so efficient and so comprehensive that it will provide an adequate substitute for armed conflict. In the opinion of my delegation, a U.N. Peace Service should include improvements in present procedures to meet three main needs:

In the first place, it should assure the greater availability of qualified persons for tasks of peaceful settlement. In all of our countries there are distinguished men whose personal qualities and practical experience enable them to discharge special responsibilities in the resolution of conflict. Let us find ways of making these men available to the U.N.—and to other international agencies.

In the second place, it should provide additional incentives for governments to resort to peaceful settlement. Nations will use available resources for peaceful settlement only as they are convinced of the benefits of cooperation—and of the costs of noncooperation.

In the third place, it should incorporate new approaches to dispute settlement whose utility has been demonstrated in recent experience.

It is now 15 years since the United Nations last engaged in a systematic study of this question. In that time the membership of the organization has more than doubled and the U.N. has accumulated all kinds of new experience in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Surely we have learned something during these years about the settlement of conflict both within and between countries.

The lessons of this experience should be examined by the group which this resolution proposes to establish. It might also be studied simultaneously by the relevant professional organizations and the great centers of learning in all of our countries.

My Government has a number of specific ideas which we will make available to the proposed committee in due course. We are considering, for example, whether the existing United Nations panel for inquiry and conciliation could be reconstructed on a new basis to make it a more efficient instrument for the performance of its tasks. We are also considering whether greater use could not be made of rapporteurs or conciliators on contentious matters before the Security Council and the General Assembly—with a view to bringing the parties together, finding the facts, and recommending possible solutions.

Our ideas on these and other subjects are not frozen. We are willing and anxious to examine each and every new proposal that may be made.

We are flexible about means. We are only inflexible about the end—a comprehensive Peace Service which can provide an effective substitute for armed conflict.

President John F. Kennedy declared, in his speech at American University in June 1963, that "peace is a process, a way of solving problems."

Mr. Chairman, we want to strengthen the process of peace. That is why we are proud to join with the United Kingdom in sponsoring this resolution. That is also why we pledge our cooperation to the proposed committee in the effort to find practical measures to improve the work of the United Nations in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

A Prayer for Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. R. L. Wheelock, Jr., of Corsicana, Tex., who has a son in Vietnam has sent me a prayer she wrote during the Christmas holidays. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include her prayer.

A NEW YEAR'S PRAYER

Let us pray that strength and courage abundant be given to all who work for a world of reason and understanding—that the good that lies in every man's heart may day by day be magnified—that men will come to see more clearly not that which divides them, but that which unites them—that each hour may bring us closer to a final victory, not of nation over nation, but of man over his own evils and weaknesses—that the true spirit of this Christmas season, its joy, its beauty, its hope, and above all, its abiding faith, may live among us—that the blessings of peace be ours, the peace to build and grow, to live in harmony and sympathy with others, and to plan for the future with confidence.

Boating Safety Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, at the National Boat Show in New York City last week the eighth annual National Gold Cup awards for boating safety were presented. Two of the four awards went to organizations from my district in Connecticut. Both were justly deserved.

Radio station WICC in Fairfield was honored in the press category for its informative marine weather reports broadcast directly from its own boat on Long Island Sound. WICC is the first commercial radio station to ever receive this award.

One of the two awards for community activities promoting boating safety went to the Norwalk small craft safety training program, a joint operation of the Norwalk YMCA, the Norwalk-Wilton chapter of the American Red Cross, the Norwalk Power Squadron, the Girl Scouts, the Boy Scouts, the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 72 and the Norwalk Department of Parks and Recreation.

These two organizations have and are continuing to do their best that the thousands of persons who enjoy use of the beautiful waters of Long Island Sound are able to do so safely.

WICC, which also won the New England Marine Trade Association's safe boating award for 1964, began its special broadcasts 7 years ago. The details of its unique contribution to boating safety were described last summer in an article in the New York Times.

The Norwalk program's activities were well described only last Friday in a special boating section of the Norwalk Hour.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, July 4, 1965]

WICC BROADCASTS AID PEOPLE ON WATER—METEOROLOGIST ON "SERVICE SIX" GIVES WEATHER REPORTS

(By William N. Wallace)

Week in and week out, Long Island Sound is a perverse body of water for the thousands who use it as a nautical playground. The problem is the weather. It is hard to know what the sound will be like on any given day, a flat frying pan, a mean tank of froth, or something pleasant in between.

Predicting the idiosyncrasies of this great recreational facility has become the challenging task of Walter Devanas, a 35-year-old meteorologist who deals with his subject at first hand for 12 hours every weekend and holiday through the summer boating season.

Devanas is one-half of the crew of a flexible floating laboratory sent to sea by radio station WICC of Bridgeport, Conn. The mother ship is a modest 27-foot Chris Craft skiff with its name, *Service Six*, prominently displayed on the topsides.

Bill Conover, a marketing executive from Old Greenwich, Conn., with a solid boating background, is the captain of *Service Six*. He plots her courses and gravitates to places where he can tap the knowledge of people to whom the sound is a way of life.

ON THE AIR

The sum knowledge of Devanas, the practical meteorologist, and Conover, the knowing boatman, is then given to listeners of WICC (600 kilocycles on the standard broadcast band). This pair comes over loud and clear on a remote relay from *Service Six* for 3-minute periods at 40 minutes after the hour beginning at 7:40 a.m. on Saturdays and 8:40 a.m. on Sundays, until 7:40 p.m.

WICC, a powerful voice that has a vast audience on both sides of Long Island Sound, is one of a handful of radio stations that seek the boatman's ear. Its service for 7 years was recently cited by the New England Marine Trades Association.

The association, which in 2 previous years had similarly honored the States of Massachusetts and New Hampshire, gave the radio station a safe boating award for promotion of safe and sane uses of the boat.

With Devanas beginning his first year on the air, WICC is safer than ever. The station is now providing its floating meteorologist, by means of shore-to-ship high frequency radio, the radar advance warning transmissions assembled on a high-speed communications system by the U.S. Weather Bureau.

BAD WEATHER LOCATED

The radar locates and tracks weather fronts, squalls, rain showers, and other aberrations, with given and moving azimuths. Armed with this information, plus the standard weather maps and other tools of the meteorologist, Devanas is prepared to stick his neck out.

"We like to believe we can tell the boatman on the sound what he can expect for surface weather in the next few hours," Devanas said. "This is a challenge because what Mark Twain said about New England weather is essentially true: 'If you don't like it, wait a minute.' "

Devanas admits that meteorology, especially when applied to such a localized area as the sound, is an imperfect science as to prediction. "It's also a young science," he said. "We are just beginning to make advances through better communications. I admit I cannot always be right in such a small area. But I call the shots as I see them. From what we can gather through mail, phone calls and the salutations we receive on the water aboard *Service Six*, the people like it."

Devanas comes to his vocation with a strong background. He spent 12 years in the U.S. Navy, almost all of the time at sea as an aerographer's mate whose task was to interpret weather for those who steered the ships.

FOR THE GREEN AT SEA

The broadcasts of Devanas and Conover are not overly sophisticated. The pair recognizes the fundamental lack of knowledge among the boating public as to weather and general seamanship. They tuck into their broadcast all kinds of educational fundamentals and only occasionally add something sophisticated, something "in."

"A couple of weeks ago," Devanas said, "we had the effects of a heavy easterly wind which had blown into the Sound. I noticed on an oceanographic level, that the easterly had brought in a considerable amount of seaweed that is normally only found in the Gulf Stream and in other warm water currents. We had a kind of Sargasso Sea in the Sound. I talked about it and a lot of people called in to say how much they appreciated that touch."

[From the Norwalk (Conn.) Hour, Jan. 14, 1966]

LOCAL SAFETY PROGRAM WINS GOLD CUP AWARD

A National Gold Cup Award for Boating Safety in 1965 was awarded to the Norwalk small craft safety training program at a reception Thursday night, at the Park Sheraton Hotel, New York City, given by the Kiekhaefer Corp., makers of the Mercury outboard motor and Mercruiser.)

Congratulations to the steering committee and appreciation and thanks for the splendid community contribution to boating safety through the Norwalk program were expressed by C. J. Koehler in behalf of Kiekhaefer Corp.

Burt Benton, Norwalk, present chairman of the steering committee, Robert Hughes. Poundridge, N.Y., 1965 chairman, and Arthur Huck, Rowayton, treasurer, were present to receive the award at the reception.

During the summer of 1965 the Norwalk small craft safety training program had logged 5,200 hours of instruction in seamanship and boat handling, both theory and practice, for youngsters in Norwalk and neighboring communities, with Gregory Geise, Darien, as head instructor.

Classes, which included 24 courses in basic boating and basic sailing and a course in advanced sailing, were held during the summer at Calf Pasture Beach adjacent to the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 72 Station.

FIFTH YEAR

The program, now in its fifth year, operates on a nonprofit, self-supporting basis with volunteers help from the community except for paid instructors. It has a fleet of five quad trainers which are used for rowing, sculling, and sailing with cat or sloop rig. There is a powerboat for patrol and instruction.

Each of the advanced sailing classes last year spent one afternoon aboard Burt Benton's schooner, *Six Fathoms*, to gain experience handling a large sailboat.

In addition to Gregory Geise, a college student who holds an American Red Cross small craft safety instructors' certificate, there were two assistant instructors, Willis Lyman and Edna Whitehead, both of Norwalk.

Seven volunteer apprentices served for various classes during the summer. These included from mariner ship *Eagle* of Norwalk, Girl Scouts Joan Bender, Nora Blum, Carmen Jacquier, Barbara Prokupek, and Nancy Wines. Other volunteers were Shena Thomson, Norwalk, and Richard Geise, Darien.

Total enrollment for classes was 217. Students, many of whom took more than one course, came from Norwalk, Darien, New Canaan, Rowayton, Stamford, Weston, Westport, and Wilton and Pelham and Poundridge, N.Y.

The steering committee, which directs and supervises the program, is comprised of representatives from organizations in the community interested in promoting boating safety and training youth in seamanship and boat handling.

COMMITTEE

The 1965 steering committee included: for the YMCA, Raymond Corbin and Mrs. Paul R. Standley; for the Norwalk-Wilton Chapter Red Cross, Frank N. Zullo; for the Norwalk Power Squadron, Past Commander and Navigator Burt Benton; for the Girl Scouts mariner ship *Eagle*, Arthur Huck; for Sea Explorers, Post 6, Boy Scouts, Len Jacob; for the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary Flotilla 72, Robert Hughes; for the Department of Parks and Recreation, Joseph Andrews.

Additions to the committee for the 1966 season include: Mrs. James Flournoy, Wilton, secretary; Robert Fink, YMCA; Mrs. George Prokupek, Southwestern Council Girl Scouts; and Robert W. Meyer, in charge of equipment maintenance.

Shipping to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the critical situation in regard to our U.S. merchant marine is especially apparent in the shortage of ships to carry needed supplies to our troops in Vietnam.

Also of great concern, is the lack of cooperation on the part of friendly nations, to prevent their ships from carrying cargo to North Vietnam, thus aiding the enemy in its fight against South Vietnam.

Two recent articles in the Baltimore Sun relative to this matter should be of great interest to our Members and therefore I am inserting them in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Sun (Baltimore, Md.), Dec. 27, 1965]

MILITARY NEEDS OVERTAX U.S. SHIPS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

WASHINGTON, December 26.—The Defense Department's Christmas message to the shipping industry emphasized once again that this country is short of sufficient American-flag ships to handle the upsurge in cargoes moving to military zones throughout the world.

And, therefore, the Military Sea Transportation Service announced December 23 that it wanted firm offers from foreign-flag shipowners as well as American companies, knowing that it probably would not be able to do much more in getting additional American vessels without going up higher on its rates.

BACKLOG MOUNTING

Even then it would be difficult immediately to get enough vessels registered in the United States to handle the military cargoes piling up in Oakland, Calif., New Orleans, New York, Norfolk, and Baltimore. There is a backlog, and the backlog is mounting daily as the discharging conditions in the Vietnam area continue in chaos. Ships cannot get rid of the cargoes they have aboard fast enough to head back to the United States to pick up additional supplies. Instead they sit for 30 days, 60 days, 70 days, and more, waiting, waiting, waiting.

It's not too much of a Christmas present for the young men in Vietnam to know that their supplies cannot get through to them because of inadequate facilities and ships backed up. However, the Defense Department has maintained steadfastly that not a soldier has suffered from the lack of any supplies.

But there must be a serious slip-up somewhere when here the United States sits 6 months after President Johnson announced the buildup of troops in order to step up the operation in Vietnam, and the shipping picture is still pathetic.

TOTAL OF 300 SHIPS CALLED OUT

In September, Representative GARMATZ, Democrat, of Maryland, acting chairman of the House Merchant Marine Committee, called for an orderly breakout of the 300 "good" ships in the reserve fleet so that the ship repair yards would not become too jammed, and so there would be an even flow of vessels becoming available to MSTS.

Under such a program it was felt that a better job could be performed in readying the vessels, particularly if the Defense Department could be induced into spending what the industry considers an adequate amount of money on each ship to make certain that it will be completely operable for the duration.

Of the first 50 ships which were taken out of mothballs in July–August, rushed through the reactivation stages, and then into service, many have broken down in midstream because of penny-pinching ascribed to readying them. At least five are currently in Hawaii in such bad condition that the big question is—What do we do with them now?

TWENTY-FIVE BEING READIED

Another 25 are being readied to begin hauling supplies to Vietnam, perhaps only from Okinawa or Subic Bay on a shuttle run. Shipping interests doubt that these vessels can hold up for very long in a Far East shuttle run without getting back to American shipyards to be "revitalized" again because of the inadequate preparation bestowed on them when they go out.

Yet even with the 25 more, MSTS admits that it will fall far short of its needs. And, therefore, it is inviting foreign owners to help relieve the shortage that this country is incurring.

Irony juts out from every porthole in the picture.

First of all, because of the vast numbers of ships in its reserve fleets, the United States since World War II has been listed as the country with the biggest merchant fleet in the world. Seldom has it been pointed out that the United States has slipped far down the line in the number of active ships.

Secondly, when a top official of the Maritime Administration last February wanted to break out just three ships from the mothball fleets in order to determine what they would ned "just in case" his suggestion was rejected by those above him as being a waste of money.

WOULD LOSE CARGOES

When they did begin breaking out the ships, they merely pumped water through the boiler tubes the first time around, leaving the oil sediment and sludge at the bottom. When the ships began operating, the boiler tubes "blew up" and more repairs were needed. It was learned that by simply adding detergent, the wastes would disappear. Such a lesson could have been learned by testing out three ships months ago instead of when they were critically needed.

Third, the "effective control" ships which the Defense Department has touted so loudly over the years are virtually worthless in an operation such as Vietnam because they are dry bulk carriers and tankers. Neither can transport the general cargo that must move to the Far East and military zones today.

Fourth, if the commercial trade routes established and promoted by American-flag berth liner companies are stripped of any more of their regular vessels, they will incur such severe losses of regular cargoes that they might never be able to recoup this trade.

And fifth, the matter of balance of payments becomes intertwined all along the line.

If American cargoes are diverted to foreign vessels on the commercial trade routes, this country loses in the balance of payments picture.

If the Defense Department has to pay increasing amounts of freight rates to foreign-flag ships to transport American military supplies, it means more gold flowing from this country.

TESTIMONY CITED

Irony and incompetence appear to best describe the sad, rather decadent scene concerning the U.S. power at sea.

It can all be traced back to 1961 when Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense, testified before a House Committee that ships were becoming passé, that air transport was the answer.

The Vietnam buildup occurred 4 years later. Two out of every three soldiers in that fighting have been moved there by ship. Ninety-eight percent of the cargo and supplies going to back up the men has been transported by ship * * * the ships which "we no longer need."

With all of the buildup on air transport, when the C–5A finally is completed in 1969–70, one airplane will be able to transport 50 tons at a time—which means that 260 planes could lift as much as a single C–4 type ship of today. And the cost abroad the C–54 as estimated now will be 4 cents a ton mile, versus one-half cent a ton mile on a ship.

[From the Sun (Baltimore, Md.) Jan. 3, 1966]

United States, British Replies Contrasted

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Washington, January 2.—The recent embargo slapped on Rhodesia by the United States carries considerable irony with it.

The United States acted to institute the embargo when Great Britain asked this country for such backing in the Commonwealth controversy over the African dependency's action.

There did not appear to be hesitation on the part of the United States about taking such action even though Rhodesia was part of the British Commonwealth.

BRITISH RESPONSE TO UNITED STATES

But the story has been different with Great Britain in connection with United States pleas to stop British-flag ships from serving Cuba and North Vietnam.

When the appeal first went out with respect to Cuba in 1962, the British attacked the United States for even making such a request and ignored this country—even though there was a danger the Communists might engage in war with the United States just 90 miles from its shores.

The British are still sending their ships to Cuba. The most recent black list released by the Maritime Administration showed that another British ship was added to bring to 75 the number of ships from the United Kingdom that have been and still are serving Cuba against United States' wishes. The list currently contains 244 free world ships.

ACCUSED OF HIGHHANDEDNESS

At the height of the Cuban trouble, the United States was accused by the British of trying to control the high seas by asking ships to stop trading with Cuba.

Even more serious than the Cuban situation, and certainly more critical to the United States than Rhodesia, is the Vietnam war, because American GI's are being killed every day. They are dying in increasing numbers as this country makes an effort to defend freedom in southeast Asia.

The U.S. Government again has asked the free world nations to stop supplying the North Vietnamese as one way of helping the soldiers fighting in that country.

The only response to that appeal has been from Greece, which in November issued a royal decree to bar Greek shipowners from sending their vessels to North Vietnam.

Although the Greek Government in the past has taken similar steps to support the United States, there are still Greek shipowners who defy its edict, changing the registry on their ships to either Liberian or Lebanese.

More recently it is noticed that several Cyprus-registered vessels are going to Cuba, as well as North Vietnam, which would indicate that Cyprus is the newest "escape" nation for registering ships.

TRADE WITH NORTH KOREA

All during the Korean war, the British and other shipowners sent vessels regularly into North Korea, carrying supplies of all kinds to the armed troops that the American GI's were battling for the rest of them.

Not once did the British pull back on their ships going to North Korea.

And it can just as well be expected now that not once will the British make any official attempt to halt British-flag ships from serving North Vietnam, from taking in ammunition and other supplies that are used by those who kill American soldiers.

The number of merchant ships supplying the enemy—North Vietnam—is said to be in the vicinity of 120 a week. There is no accurate figure available, but it is known to be substantial.

During the last session of Congress, Representative Rogers, Democrat, of Florida, several times appealed for legislation to bar countries serving North Vietnam from sending their ships to U.S. ports, or at least to keep them from carrying Government-financed cargoes from these shores, which is what the Cuba blacklist stops.

But the administration appeared to ignore all such pleas.

The State Department would only say that there has been some curtailment of calls to North Vietnam by friendly nations to whom appeals have been made to halt such shipments.

There has never been any more than that.

At the recent AFL–CIO Biennial Convention, organized labor called upon the Government to take drastic steps against ships and shipowners who persist in calling at North Vietnam. The maritime labor unions intend to follow through on this resolution.

Among the stories circulating regarding the supply ships going to North Vietnam is that many of them profit by calling on one trip at North Vietnam and, on another, at a South Vietnamese port.

CONGESTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Of course, right now with the congestion in Saigon, Da Nang, and other southern ports, it would hardly seem profitable for any vessel to call there unless hired on a daily time charter.

More of the irony is that many of the ships being used on the Vietcong supply route, as has been true with Cuba, were American built, Liberty type sold after World War II at greatly reduced prices to help our friends build up their fleets and get back into business on the high seas.

Could it be that one of the reasons the U.S. Armed Forces have been held back from mining the waters leading to Haiphong is that some of the ships that might be sunk would be those of Great Britain, Norway, Sweden, Germany, and other friendly nations?

Veterans' Administration Medical Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is currently in the process of tabulating a number of replies to a questionnaire on the quality of medical care sent to all recently discharged patients from Veterans' Administration general hospitals. I plan to make a full report on this questionnaire at a later date.

However, I have today received a letter from a veteran in Maine, Mr. John R. Whittaker, which speaks in glowing terms of the care he received at the Veterans' Administration hospital, West Roxbury, Mass. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of Mr. Whittaker's letter:

Sanford, Maine.

Sirs: I am writing this on separate paper, rather than the form, because I have some comments to make, as a reflection of my own experience at the veterans hospital, West Roxbury, Mass.

I first entered the hospital in September of 1960, at the age of 26. I'm a member of the Korean conflict, but am treated at the hospital for a non-service-connected kidney ailment. There is no question about the fact that I was scared when I was first admitted, because I had never been a patient in my life. They didn't know just what was wrong with me, at first, and as a result I had to undergo many tests—every one in the book, I believe. However, they found the trouble, did what they had to do, and I believe that I had the best of care possible. Well, that was 6 years ago, and I still go for periodic checks and tests, because my condition is chronic. I feel that I am being treated with the very best of everything available in this day and age. I feel I have cooperated fully with all doctors and aids, and as a result I have been treated accordingly. This is the only hospital at which I have ever been a patient, and so it goes without saying that I can't speak for others. My own personal hope is that as long as I must have a hospital to go to, every so often, I hope that VA hospital, West Roxbury is always available.

I was proud to do my bit for my country. I'm extremely proud to be a veteran of America. I'm thankful, beyond expression that I have the VA available to me, and I think that 6 years of hospital treatment is ample time to view my feelings on this subject. As far as I'm concerned, they are 100-percent OK, and I sincerely hope and pray that they keep up the good work—may God bless them for it.

Very sincerely yours,
John R. Whittaker.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the Congressional Record, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

Office Address: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*	
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*	
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev*	
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*	
Byrd, Harry F., Jr., *Va*	
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*	
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*	Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*	
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*	
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*	
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*	
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*	
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*	
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*	5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*	
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*	
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*	
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*	
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*	
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*	
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Edward V., *Mo*	
Long, Russell E., *La*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*	
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*	
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*	
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*	453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa*	5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*	
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*	
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*	
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*	
Pastore, John O., *R.I*	
Pearson, James B., *Kans*	
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I*	3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*	4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*	
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*	
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*	
Tower, John G., *Tex*	
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*	
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del*	
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Robert G. Dunphy.
Chief Clerk—Darrell St. Claire.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Byrd of Virginia, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Byrd of Virginia, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Long of Louisiana (chairman), Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Metcalf, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Tydings, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Fortas, of Tennessee, 3210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Vacancy

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Fortas. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

A Call for National Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of receiving from Dr. J. H. Jackson, president of the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., who resides in Chicago, Ill., a well-thought-out and well-written pamphlet entitled "A Call for National Unitey," a call which is certainly our foremost desire to heed.

Mr. President, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to Dr. Jackson's pamphlet and ask that the pamphlet be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR NATIONAL UNITY

(By Dr. J. H. Jackson, president, National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., Aug. 31, 1965)

(NOTE.—The following call to national unity was unanimously adopted by the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., in its 85th session in Jacksonville, Fla., September 1965. The call grew out of the conviction that all American citizens and that all groups within the confines of the Nation must work together not only to attain the good things of life for themselves but also to fulfill the Nation's life. The National Baptist Convention has a membership of 5½ million and is the largest organized body of Negroes in the United States.)

The United States of America is a great democratic Republic dedicated to human dignity, justice, freedom, and equality of opportunity for all. Her supreme law, the Federal Constitution, is so constructed and so structured that it allows for political, social, and economic evolution and basic changes by amendments. Therefore, all Americans—both conservatives and liberals—can support and be loyal to the Federal Constitution and to the Nation itself. All citizens can obey its fundamental principles and take part in its evolutionary changes through amendments when time, experience, and change demand it.

In this hour of crisis we call upon all American citizens and all groups to support the fundamental principles of the Nation's life. We would call upon all to support the following ideas:

1. Unqualified loyalty to and support of the Nation as a whole.

2. Risk all that we have and possess for the life, soul, and salvation of the Nation, and trust a just Nation to protect and save us as citizens and all that we hold dear, so long as it does not include the values of religion which are above the dominion of the state.

3. Let us recognize that our common enemies are those persons and groups who by ideology and purpose are committed to the destruction of this Nation and that these enemies make use of all of our divisions to weaken and to destroy this Republic.

4. We must recognize the fact that it is better to live in an imperfect America with the freedom to work for its improvement and fulfillment than to be a helpless slave in a perfect totalitarian state without the freedom even to question its policies or to change its evil practices.

5. Let us always recognize the right of freedom of thought, freedom of expression, and freedom of action as well as the rights to differ with and to be different from others. But let us never seek to defend and protect these differences by denying to others their constitutional, just, and God-given rights as freemen in a free society.

6. Let us be as wise as the enemies of this Nation who—when it is to their advantage—will join with any groups in the United States and work through them for their evil purposes. If being a segregationist furthers their cause, these enemies will join the ranks of segregationists. If and when they find being an integrationist serves their purpose to negate the Nation's life, they will become integrationists and work through integration to achieve their negative ends. They will also play one group against another to divide and to weaken the Nation.

We are in a national crisis and at this moment are engaged in a bloody conflict with international communism in Vietnam and are potentially in conflict with the same forces throughout the world as well as at home. Americans can no longer afford the luxury and the negative weight of past prejudices, hatred, envy, discrimination, disrespect for law and order, disrespect for one another, race riots, and bloodshed. All of us must unite and work together as one for the Nation's life and cause, or we will eventually perish.

7. All groups are called upon to rise above the differences of creed, color, caste and to join together as Americans in order to work for, live for, and—if need be—die for the ideals, values, and principles of justice, freedom, and equality as proclaimed by this great Nation.

8. We are called upon not only to obey Federal law, but also to rise above it and make a good-neighbor policy of our own by which we will build a community spirit and erect community organizations based on good will for the education of our children, for the security and development of our family, for the advancement of culture, and for the moral and spiritual growth of all who dwell therein. This can be done only by cooperation and not by contest and conflict. Such community spirit will not only enrich our several communities but also will greatly strengthen our National Government both at home and abroad.

9. This call is for positive thinking and for positive action. It is not enough to be anti-Communist, antipoverty, antisegregationist, antiintegrationist; we must be pro-American, profreedom, projustice, and progoodwill. A commitment to build a great democratic society for the enrichment of human personality is far more elevating and far more lofty than setting ourselves to the task of destroying the enemies that disturb us.

10. A cooperative venture among the citizens of the United States for the advancement of the ideals of justice and freedom does not in any way jeopardize the legitimate privileges and the moral goods of free enterprise nor does it imperil the personal rights of individuals and groups. To paraphrase the historic statement of the great educator Booker T. Washington, in all things strictly personal and in all matters purely private we can be as separate as the fingers, but one as the hand in all things tending toward the mutual progress of the individual, of groups, as well as the fulfillment of the Nation's life itself.

Praise for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Americans have always believed that honest work is noble. By his hard work, the American provides his loved ones with the good life. Many a workingman who was not able to go to college himself has provided a higher education for his sons and daughters.

We can all be proud of the great strength of the American economy, which provides a solid foundation for the good life all of us strive to achieve.

The Council of Economic Advisers has felt that if 96 percent of the labor force could be on the job, it was about as close to full employment as the Nation could expect to come.

The state of economic health in America is so good that it has almost reached that happy situation of full employment.

The Denver Post recently carried an editorial—"United States Has Achieved 'Full Employment' "—praising the administration's great strides in building and keeping a sound national economy. With permission of my colleagues I submit this article for the RECORD:

UNITED STATES HAS ACHIEVED FULL EMPLOYMENT

Five years ago when the Nation was beginning to recover from its last recession, President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers set an unemployment figure of 4 percent of the labor force as a realistic target for the American economy.

The Council recognized that some people will always be in between jobs, that some will be untrained or unsuitable for the jobs available and that some will not be employable at all.

If 96 percent of the labor force could be on the job, however, the Council said that was about as close to full employment as the Nation could expect to come.

Since 1961, the United States has moved slowly but steadily toward the full employment rate the Council set. Last week, the Government announced that unemployment had dropped to 4.1 percent, which puts us only a whisker away from the goal.

When we reach 4 percent unemployment, the Council suggested, the supply of labor will not be excessively tight and the danger of inflation will not be beyond control. The economy, in fact, will be in a state of exuberant health.

If we go much below 4 percent, on the other hand, the Council thought we would face "substantial upward pressure on prices" and implied major steps would have to be taken to cope with inflation.

The American economy now appears to be in the state of health the Council described. The Government has announced that with 4.1 percent unemployment "there is still no evidence of a general shortage of labor." At the same time, inflation has not become a major problem.

The Council's 5-year-old warning, however, that there may be danger ahead if the trend continues, is well worth heeding. As we continue to work for a lower unemployment rate, we will need to be increasingly alert to the danger of labor shortages and the danger of inflation.

In the months ahead, both the Government and private industry can take additional steps to draw more people into the labor force and to train them for the new kinds of jobs that have to be filled.

Labor and industry, through voluntary restraint, can help to hold wages and prices in line and prevent a runaway inflation from developing.

There may be a time when the administration will have to press for a tax increase, and we will expect President Johnson to act quickly and forcefully if that time should arise.

In the meantime, we believe the President is wise not to molest the economy in its present state of health while he watches it closely for signs of future trouble.

As things stand now, the continuing decline in unemployment is a source of satisfaction and pride. For all practical purposes, the goal of 5 years ago has now been achieved.

Summary of World Conference on World Peace Through World Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the October 27 issue of the Christian Century carried a summary of the World Conference on World Peace Through World Law, which was held in Washington last fall. The author is Mr. Howard Y. Williams, State field director for the Minnesota United World Federalists. I ask unanimous consent that his report be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

World Peace Through World Law

(By Howard Y. Williams)

FROM MANY LANDS

"The quest for a world ruled by law must succeed if mankind is to survive," Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court declared in the keynote address to the World Conference on World Peace Through World Law, which brought some 3,000 judges, lawyers, and interested laymen to Washington, D.C., in mid-September. He continued: "I believe we of our generation can translate the centuries-old dream of a world ruled by law from dream into reality. We must succeed in order to survive."

Of the participants in the conference, one-third had come from 110 countries other than the United States. The Communist nations had been invited to send representatives, but none did so. Cost of the conference—around $465,000—was borne by U.S. foundations and corporations and by individual lawyers. The proceedings opened with a procession of 263 judges and 59 ministers of justice or attorneys general representing every continent, marching in their judicial robes and wigs.

As discussions developed, a real difference of opinion appeared as to whether world law should be enforceable. In a particularly brilliant address Lord Denning of England, master of the rolls and chairman of the Magna Carta Trust, called for a limited world government through law, with sovereign states existing under world law even as a sovereign exists under the law of his own country. On the other hand, Henry R. Luce, editorial chairman of Time, Inc., declared that world government is not only impossible but undesirable in the foreseeable future—a sentiment he insisted is shared by most people. Nevertheless, even he acknowledged that the notion of world government is not irrelevant: "At the rate at which the world is going, it is not difficult to imagine that one way or another, and like it or not, world government might become a fact—by, say, the year 2000."

ESSENTIAL: ENFORCEMENT POWER

After the opening addresses commemorating World Law Day 3 days were given to 12 workshops covering existing and proposed international courts, space law, international law in domestic courts, international communications, transnational trade and investment, arbitral tribunals, human rights, international judicial cooperation, disarmament, industrial and intellectaual property, creative research and education in international law, and expanding structure of international law: peacekeeping, general principles, international organizations.

Working papers were presented by outstanding authorities, considered by panelists, then opened to discussion from the floor. To this correspondent it seemed incomprehensible that anyone could sit through those sessions and not recognize that without enforcement world law is a very weak concept. Alex Quaison-Sackey of Ghana, a former president of the United Nations General Assembly, insisted that a resolution passed by a two-thirds vote in the Assembly should enjoy the status of law that nations must obey, and that absence of any sanction or authority to enforce the law makes the law of nations uneasy law. One can disagree with him on the two-thirds vote matter, since under the present "one nation, one vote" rule such a resolution might be passed by nations representing a minority of the world's population. But his emphasis on enforcement seemed essential.

Likewise, in the workship on disarmament, U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said: "Disarmament won't work unless there is a law to enforce it. Disarmament will not be achieved unless all nations are prepared to yield a certain amount of sovereignty, and to be creative and imaginative in erecting new international institutions to carry out the job." He called for a vetoless international disarmament organization to insure compliance, an adequate world police force and international tribunals of mediation, conciliation, and adjudication.

EUROPEAN ACHIEVEMENT

Allesandra Luini del Russo, professor of international law at Howard University, received a standing ovation at the conclusion of her working paper on human rights. She traced the growth of protection for human rights, culminating in the U.N. Charter, showing how this action was prompted by the desire to prevent any recurrence of the indignities and atrocities perpetrated in World War II by totalitarian nations which had succeeded in gradually stripping their citizens of all fundamental freedoms, even of life, in the name of the supreme authority of the state. She reported that though no agreement has yet been accepted by the world community the U.N. Charter has inspired some 16 European nations to establish an international system of collective enforcement of human rights through the creation of a European Commission and a European Court of Human Rights. For that purpose each state has surrendered a portion of its traditional sovereignty over individual rights within its boundaries. The importance of this experiment and the effectiveness of the remedy are verified by the fact that in its 10 years of life the commission has received over a 2,200 individual petitions as compared with only three complaints filed by one member state against another. As a result other regional areas of the world are planning to adopt a similar plan.

In the plenary sessions held the last 2 days of the conference the judges and lawyers adopted a declaration of faith pledging to work for a world ruled by international law, under a global judicial system through which all disputes would be settled without resort to war. They called for an amendment to the U.N. Charter to establish compulsory jurisdiction for the World Court of International Justice, with individuals as well as nations entitled to bring cases before it for judgment; for the erection of regional courts to take advantage of common cultural ties and hear disputes between regional nations as well as individuals; and for regional human rights conventions like the one that now binds certain European nations. The next conference will be held in New Delhi, India, in 1967.

A Summary of Federal Assistance to All Forms of Education During Recent Fiscal Years in Hamilton County, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, education is the keystone of the democratic arch. It has become increasingly important to our free society as our social and economic structure becomes more complex, more difficult to understand, and less yielding to old and too-simple remedies for its ills.

This Congress has already passed legislation to improve the educational opportunities of our citizens which is truly historic. It is my hope that what we did last session will be supported and enlarged upon by our actions this session.

It is vitally important that the public be informed of how their national tax dollars are being spent. I am sure that many citizens of my district will be astounded to learn that over $32 million was spent during the last fiscal year in Hamilton County on education and public health programs.

In order that the citizens are fully informed, I have compiled the following information, which deals with the size

and placement of national tax funds in the fields of education and public health in Hamilton County. I have used the word education generally, to include research, teaching, administration, along with supporting medical, dental, technical, and food support programs. Statistics have been furnished by departments and agencies of the National, State, and local governments.

I include this information at this point in the RECORD:

A summary of Federal assistance to all forms of education during recent fiscal years in Hamilton County, Ohio

DEPARTMENT OF ARICULTURE

	Fiscal 1964	Fiscal 1965 (preliminary)
Consumer and Marketing Service:		
National school lunch program, cash payments for food assistance	$291,042	$345,075
Special milk program for children	625,118	608,196
Donation of agricultural commodities to schools and welfare agencies	1,741,095	2,644,168
Agricultural Research Service: Contract with University of Cincinnati for research on leather (duration 2½ years)	85,430	
Total, Department of Agriculture	2,742,685	3,597,438

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

(PROGRAMS RELATED TO THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964)

	Grant
Project Head Start:	
Hamilton Board of Education (246 children; 12 centers)	$30,531
Board of Education of Cincinnati (1,720 children; 31 centers)	224,199
Total (1,966 children; 43 centers)	254,730
Neighborhood Youth Corps (through Department of Labor):	
12,000 enrollees	1,460,150
1,050 enrollees	198,713
750 enrollees	148,595
300 enrollees	140,940
830 enrollees	234,270
Total (14,930 enrollees)	2,182,668
College work study program:	
Spring:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	2,268
University of Cincinnati	6,170
Xavier University	4,119
Total	12,557
Summer:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	2,925
Xavier University	5,426
Total	8,351
Fall:	
Ohio College of Applied Science	5,257
University of Cincinnati	29,575
Xavier University	9,485
Total	44,317
Total, college work study programs	65,225
Additional Community Action Commission programs:	
School community center program	145,293
Preschool program:	
Cincinnati Board of Education	121,500
Lincoln Heights, Ohio	33,812
Montessori method preschool program	36,776
Dental care program for schoolchildren	192,064
Recreational therapy programs, institutions for the aged	82,750
Steele subdivision preschool and neighborhood services	55,328
Total	667,523
Total, Office of Economic Opportunity	3,170,146

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION GRANTS TO THE STATE OF OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR CINCINNATI, OHIO, BOARD OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

	1962-63	1963-64
Smith-Hughes	$24,985.50	$16,152.20
George-Barden:		
Title I	37,256.46	40,545.70
Title II	16,860.59	17,080.49
Total, vocational education	79,102.55	73,778.39

NOTE.—Totals available from Ohio Board of Education only for 1962-63 and 1963-64. Little variation expected to be shown in expenditures for later years. Information about non-Cincinnati boards of education in Hamilton County not received from Ohio Board of Education.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

	1965
University of Cincinnati	$417,000

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

	1965
University of Cincinnati (research grant)	$59,597
University of Cincinnati (teaching grant)	20,000
Total, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	79,597

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

	1965
Education and training allowance, veteran	$25,100
Vocational rehabilitation, veteran	19,800
Total	44,900

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

	1963	1964	1965
Educational contracts and research:			
University of Cincinnati	$52,000	$12,000	$9,000
May Institute for Medical Research		15,000	15,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in Cincinnati		49,000	
Xavier University	1,000	15,000	
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	53,000	91,000	24,000

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION—TOTAL LOANS APPROVED

	1963	1964	1965
Cincinnati area:			
Xavier University	$1,250,000		
University of Cincinnati	6,160,000		
Deaconess Hospital of Nursing			$700,000
Total	7,410,000		700,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	1963	1964	1965
Xavier University:			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans	$55,697	$87,300	$118,044
Construction grants			572,608
College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	27,731	42,968	50,000
Ohio College of Applied Science: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	6,061	10,550	20,714
Our Lady of Cincinnati College: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	6,756	10,210	(1)
University of Cincinnati: Training grants, fellowships, and loans	301,000	305,103	323,800
Greenhills Exempted Village School District: Project grants	13,387	13,641	20,580
Loveland Exempted Village School District: Project grants	2,476		
Southwest Local School District: Project grants	29,154	29,650	28,349
Mount Healthy City School District: Project grants	5,266		
Princeton City School District: Project grants	32,761	15,281	
Finneytown Local Board of Education: Project grants	23,946	11,864	
Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County Northern Hill Branch: Construction grant			75,000
Total			1,200,186
FUNDS TRANSFERRED FROM DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans:			
Stowe Adult Center	84,030		
Central Vocational High School		21,503	
Cincinnati Board of Education			170,166
Norwood Evening School			7,464
Norwood Technical High School			10,422
Central Adult High School			21,316
Total			209,368

A summary of Federal assistance to all forms of education during recent fiscal years in Hamilton County, Ohio—Continued

	1963	1964	1965
WELFARE ADMINISTRATION ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES, CUBAN LOAN PROGRAM			
Training grants, fellowships, and loans:			
Ohio College of Applied Science			$1,939
Our Lady of Cincinnati College	$1,500	$1,023	2,716
University of Cincinnati			750
Xavier University	2,350	3,045	6,500
Total			11,905
Total, Office of Education			1,430,277

[1] Figures not available.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Grants to colleges and universities in Hamilton County	$27,000

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Recipient	Research and demonstration grants	Construction grants	Training grants, fellowships, and loans	Project grants	All other	Total
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE DEPARTMENT						
Children's Hospital, Cincinnati	53,567					53,567
Children's Hospital Research Foundation	709,337	1,724,000	58,017			2,486,354
Cincinnati Bureau of Air Pollution Control	12,600					12,600
University of Cincinnati	2,122,402		1,702,651	34,002		3,859,055
University of Cincinnati, College of Medicine	287,157				8,559	295,716
Family Services, Cincinnati	63,788					63,788
Institutum Divithomae	13,800					13,800
Jewish Hospital of Cincinnati	278,964		27,968			306,932
College of Mount St. Joseph on the Ohio			29,276			29,276
Rollman Psychiatric Hospital			24,000			24,000
Xavier University	6,900		2,995			9,895
Community Chest and Council of Cincinnati, Inc				42,850		42,850
Bethesda Hospital School of Nursing			7,234			7,234
Deaconness Hospital		350,000	3,407			353,407
Good Samaritan Hospital School of Nursing			14,219			14,219
Cincinnati General Hospital		2,333,198				2,333,198
Riverview Home		385,000				385,000
St. George Hospital		500,000				500,000
State health department					$1,500	1,500
Taft Sanitary Engineering Center					12,087,371	12,087,371
Total, funds appropriated to the Department	3,548,515	5,292,198	1,864,767	76,852	12,097,430	22,879,742

SUMMARY BY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION

	1965
Department of Agriculture	$3,597,438
Office of Economic Opportunity	3,170,146
Vocational Education	73,778
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	417,000
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	79,597
Veterans' Administration	44,900
Atomic Energy Commission	23,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	700,000
Office of Education (HEW)	1,430,277
National Science Foundation	27,000
HEW (Public Health Service)	22,879,742
Grand total	32,643,886

House Out of Order—A Book Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to have printed in the Appendix for the benefit of my colleagues Judge David Bazelon's review of Congressman BOLLING's book entitled "House Out of Order." The book is a good one and well worth reading and considering.

There being no objection, the book review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Commentary, December 1965]

"HOUSE OUT OF ORDER," BY RICHARD BOLLING

(Reviewed by David T. Bazelon)

"House Out of Order" was written to stimulate opinionmakers to "inform the American people about the wretched condition of their National Legislature." Considering the source, it is a startling book—something like an event in American politics.

RICHARD BOLLING has represented a district from Kansas City in the House of Representatives for more than 15 years; and eight terms is a serious matter in the House. Even more significant, Representative BOLLING was for a number of years a prime protege of the late Speaker Sam Rayburn, so he is informed as to the inner workings of the House as few Members are ever privileged to be. He is, moreover, an important liberal leader—strong enough, a few years ago after the death of Rayburn, to buck for the position of majority leader (unsuccessfully). But apart from the credentials of the author, the argument of the book is right. It concludes as follows: "The failure of the House is the failure of the Democratic Party of which I am a member. Its responsibility cannot be evaded much longer without reducing the national assembly to impotence, which would mean a vital failure in the democratic process itself."

Again considering the source, the book is at times nearly brutal. A politician still very in business, BOLLING indulges in both honest and sharp remarks that one imagines his friends would have advised him against; and it would take a serious enemy—either of BOLLING personally or of politicians generally—to fault him for not indulging the further honesty of which he is probably capable. As might be expected, the edge of BOLLING's blade cuts most frequently into reactionary southerners: he characterizes his notorious colleague on the Rules Committee, *WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi,* for example, as inhabiting a political position "perhaps slightly to the left of Ivan the Terrible." But reactionary southerners aren't his exclusive target. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, for instance, gets this one: "His attention span has been variously estimated as ranging between 40 seconds to 2 minutes." And concerning the recently defeated 15-term boss of the Bronx, he quotes a veteran reporter as saying "he wished 'Charlie Buckley had stayed around a few more years; I would have liked to have met him.' "

(It should be mentioned that wisecracks like these are probably the work of BOLLING's writer-collaborator, an ex-newspaperman by the name of Wes Barthelmes who has earned honest knowledge of the House on his own as an assistant to Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, and who is now public relations man for Senator ROBERT KENNEDY. I would also guess that the shrewd and nasty chapter on the press, which is excellent, owes much to the same source. This chapter delineates the "client" or buddy system wherein a big public figure and a newspaperman collaborate regularly, so to speak. In Washington a reporter is about equal to his sources, and the latter naturally feel entitled to some consideration for serving as such.)

As I thumb through the book trying to decide what must be mentioned in a review, and what may be left out, I am convinced, even more than I was before, of the importance of BOLLING's act. This level of incisive candor, in an ambitious American politician, is nearly unheard of—it is culturally revolutionary.

Politicians have many more substantial reasons than the rest of us for not being honest in public. We demand that they tell us either that everything is all right, or that only the other guy is doing dirty. Meanwhile, we place this creature of ours in the *kitchen where social policy is being cooked:* no matter what his personal nature or predilection, his immediate circumstance continuously confronts him with the responsibility for applying power to the solution of problems—that is, concocting policy. This gives us two kinds of politicians—those who try very hard, and those who don't try so hard, to meet the responsibility; or, to put it another way, those who begin sooner and more strenuously to protect themselves from the kitchen heat, as against those who defend less and later. The difference is not between the noble battler and the crooked bum; the difference is not a matter of purity and honesty (politics, like most important activities, is impossible without a reasonable amount of corner cutting and lying). The difference concerns that underlying goodness and seriousness of soul (difficult or impossible to judge) whereby one does not "give up" until one has run out of the strength to keep "giving." No more can ever be asked of any man in any situation.

BOLLING has told a story that many politicians could have told. The reason he did and others have not, is that he is a fallen golden boy who has not yet run out of strength. He is too big to quit quietly (also he is probably—and justifiably—angry, although the book is written without rancor). During the 1950's, he was the bridge between Rayburn and the liberals—just as HUMPHREY, on the other side of the Hill, was the bridge between Johnson and the liberals. But when Rayburn died and BOLLING could no longer "deliver" him, the liberals decided in their august purity that BOLLING had cut too many corners and defied too many pieties in his previous brokerage. So another Parnell was dumped.

His response has been to seek the last refuge of the politician, to tell the simple truth—the simple truth about power. But this is impossible: power is so intimately compounded of deception and vague threat, that to state the truth about a power situation within the hearing of its inhabitants is to change the object being described—incalculably. Unless, by chance, one of those rare moments is at-the-ready when nothing less than the simple truth can any longer resolve an intolerable situation.[1] As to this and BOLLING's book, we shall see.

There is much structural detail of interest in the book. As BOLLING goes over the now-familiar facts concerning the committee system, seniority, the delicate cohesion of the Democratic Party, and so on, we become more and more aware that we are hearing the especially authoritative voice of Rayburn's representative for many years on the Rules Committee, the man who moved sensitively between the Democratic Study Group and the hierarchy—and the heirarchy means the Great Broker, Rayburn himself, who trained our current President in the realties of Amercan politics. For obvious reasons, therefore, most interesting of all is what BOLLING has to say about Rayburn and his relation to the liberals, at this special point in BOLLING's career where he is reduced to the final ploy of honesty.

The key to his view of Rayburn, as set forth in this book, is stated on page 69: "As Speaker, Rayburn used his strength sparingly. He subscribed to the belief that oftentimes withheld power is preferable to committed power that may not carry the day." Later, he says of Rayburn's relation to HOWARD SMITH of the Rules Committee—before the 1961 battle which, involving nothing but the clash of giants, will be appreciated mostly by historians—"on many occasions Rayburn virtually had to beg SMITH to release important bills." For this frail giant who died, BOLLING played "politics" with the liberals. And what of them?

He coins a phrase to describe the worst of them: "One species of House liberal is totalitarian in temperament and occasionally seized with fits of voodooism. He sees the liberal program as a holy tablet to which liberals all must give unswerving allegiance—or else risk being read out of the liberal ranks." There are, threafter, regular references to the "voodoo liberal" in BOLLING's description of who did what, and why, and then what happened. He offers many additional characterizations of the "voodoo liberal," but this is the one (for me) that sticks: "He distrusts power; indeed, he treats it as some sort of dirty weapon." BOLLING's problem is that—out of whatever type of frontline ambition—he volunteered as a reconnaissance gunner. Then the troops he expected to fall in behind him went to church on court-martial Sunday.

When he says the House is "a lobby for arrogant brokers of special privilege," he not only knows what he is talking about, but he knows whom he is telling it to. How often does this happen, in public, in American political life?. Representative BOLLING is—in a rather modern, agonized way—trying to tell the "voodoo liberals" in the House that they live in a kitchen in which "pure" thought has no more and just about as much relevance as a timely pinch of oregano.

Purity will not bring us through; and after we get through anyway, it will not lead us anywhere. I hope that the other important congressional reformers like Senator JOSEPH CLARK and Representative HENRY REUSS will find the courage to support the clear, simple, practical, efficient, and revolutionary prescription which RICHARD BOLLING has presented with a superb economy of phrasing: "Basic flaws in party organization are reflected in the power structure of the House. They are entirely the responsibility of House Democrats, and the Democrats alone have the means at hand to correct them." His prescription is to lodge congressional power (control over committee chairmanships and presumably the disciplinary effect of the distribution of all the factors that help in reelection) in the Democratic caucus, using the Speaker as the organizing instrument of the caucus (so that, for instance, the same caucus contests would not recur daily). With these power adjustments accomplished, the party and its program—whether in control or in opposition—would be decently related.

This in the sole reform BOLLING proposes. It is all that is necessary; and nothing else will really help.

It is the only way to overcome the elaborate system of absurd and corrupt brokerage which is all that most of us understand the House to be, as if it were some kind of fatal American inevitability. It is not. Given a reasonable understanding of the nature of power on the part of American liberals generally, it is so little inevitable that it probably need never have happened. However that may be, it can persist only as that particular lack of understanding persists. And how it can persist while the same American liberals support President Johnson as if he were a congressional magician, whereas in fact he merely understands our power system better than they do, is a spiritual problem I will not deal with here. Liberals are supposed to fail for lack of money, not for lack of intelligence.

---

[1] Not every otherwise-all-right observer agrees with this interpretation. Representative BOLLING has a rather strange and beclouded "reputation" in Washington. He is characterized variously as an unemployed errand boy, a no-work specialist, a playboy, and an ineffective operator with only one foot in the Democratic Study Group. But outside of Washington, he was known as the coming liberal leader; and I personally like his general public appearance, in this book and elsewhere. The difficulty in evaluating his past role and failure is that it is so intimately bound up with the much larger matter of liberal disorganization in the House.

Education Is the Real Answer to Poverty and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the minority leader of the House came out wholeheartedly in favor of education. He said what the House majority—and the Senate majority and the President—have been saying all along: that education is the real answer to the problem of poverty and unemployment.

This may represent a change in Republican policy—or it may not. It cannot be forgotten that 3 out of 4 of the Republicans in the House and nearly half of the Republicans in the Senate voted against the Elementary-Secondary School Education Act of 1965. But, if the Republicans have had a change of heart on this issue, they propose a rather strange way for solving the problem.

The only firm proposal in last night's speech was for a Federal income tax credit for college students and their parents. What they will do, in other words, is to make it easier for the well-to-do to send their children to college by transferring part of the burden to all the taxpayers. To the family whose entire income may be little more than the cost of a year in college, the Republican proposal would give nothing whatever. Such a tax break would reduce Federal taxes by perhaps a billion dollars annually. Yet, it could not guarantee that so much as one boy or girl who does not now go to college would be added to the rolls. Most emphatically, it would do nothing to guarantee that every youth should pursue his education as far as his talents would take him. The talented boy from an impoverished family would be no better off than he is today.

Our real aim in education must be to improve educational resources and to provide opportunities for every student whose family cannot afford to send him to college. The best methods are scholarship, fellowships, loans—money placed at the disposal of those who need it, and not by providing tax windfalls to those families whose children already have access to college programs.

Constantino Brumidi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced legislation to authorize procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed in the Capitol's first floor Brumidi corridor.

Certainly the Capitol should somewhere have a bust or portrait of the artist who did so much to beautify it. The Capitol is a far more beautiful place because of Brumidi's murals, paintings, and frescoes.

Constantino Brumidi left mid-19th-century Italy as a political refugee, vowing to find liberty. He found it in America, and beginning in 1855, worked 25 years to make the Capitol the inspirationally beautiful seat of liberty that it is today.

I hope that the Committee on House Administration will give this legislation serious and favorable consideration.

Address of Commissioner George H. Hearn Before the Foreign Commerce Club of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on October 20, 1965, Commissioner George H. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, addressed the 23d Annual Steamship Night Banquet of the Foreign Commerce Club of New York. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his address:

FOREIGN COMMERCE AND ITS EFFECT ON THE PORT OF NEW YORK

It is always a pleasure for me to return home to New York City and it is a distinct honor to have been invited to speak at the 23d annual steamship night banquet of the august Foreign Commerce Club of New York.

I know we New Yorkers are often accused of being chauvinistic about our great city. But the record supports our claims. New York City is the hub of planetary government, and as the seat of the United Nations it is the pulsating nerve center of the world. Our incomparable Wall Street makes New York the world's financial capital. Our unexcelled broadcast media establish New York as the communications heart of the globe and the confluence of God-given natural advantages especially this harbor, the historical development of the United States and the throngs of men of trade genius who have always found their way to this great city, have made it truly the commercial focal point of the world. Consequently, I would be seriously remiss, tonight, if I did not publicly salute you who have contributed so greatly to the success of New York's, and the Nation's waterborne commerce down through the years. In this regard, I am happy to acknowledge the fact that the Foreign Commerce Club, dedicated, as its charter states "to the upbuilding of the foreign commerce," is well into its second half century. I naturally wish it well particularly for the reason that the Foreign Commerce Club and the Federal Maritime Commission share a common mission, that this, the ever increasing growth of our foreign commerce. It is my sworn obligation, to assist the flow of our foreign and domestic water borne commerce, for that is the ultimate purpose of the statutes committed by the Congress to our Commission.

Before continuing, however, let us look at the recent record compiled here in New York. Aided and abetted by you and by your organization, New York has been established as the largest and most influential trade center of our times. Our port has the services of over 20 steamship conferences. More than 55 liners alone maintain regularly scheduled service here in worldwide trades. In 1963 over 42 million tons of cargo, general and bulk, passed through this port in our foreign commerce. When we consider liner-type cargoes alone, in 1963 the Port of New York handled cargoes amounting to almost one-quarter of the Nation's import and export foreign commerce. Further, you dedicated trade-conscious men here, have exhibited admirable efforts to compile for New York this great record. We are hosts to the trade promotion missions of at least 16 foreign nations and 25 consulates. Our $350 million World Trade Center, which will be a colossal reality in but a few years is powerful evidence that New York not only does not intend to lose its international commercial preeminence but indeed, is determined to enhance its record. Figures, particularly when they become astronomically large, have a tendency to lose their true meaning and fail to project their real significance.

Consequently, without attempting to burden you with the total dollar impact of foreign trade on Greater New York, I will state an obvious truism, a truism however, that many men, particularly men not involved in commerce, are unmindful of: Every man, woman, and child in this city derives a tangible, meaningful, and substantial economic benefit from the level of New York's international trade undertakings. And to my mind, the awesome possibilities of periods of commercial inactivity on our waterfront and on our sealanes, represent a most serious threat to New York's standing as the world's leader in oceanborne international commerce. In this vein, we have all witnessed right here in New York the unhappy, almost total, demise of the export grain business. A lesson should be taken from that experience so that the movements of other bulk cargoes and general cargoes are not adversely affected.

Now the Federal Maritime Commission, as I said, is also devoted to the movements of our foreign commerce. We are not, as many suppose, dedicated to the promotion of American-flag vessels. This promotional responsibility, since 1961, has not been the concern of the Commission. Our Nation has traditionally followed the doctrines of freedom of the seas. Indeed, this freedom aided our prosperity down through the years. Moreover, the Shipping Act tacitly, yet powerfully gives impetus to that doctrine. Foreign-flag carriers are welcome to participate in our international trades, and indeed they do so to a very great extent. The Shipping Act does not favor or disadvantage vessels of any particular flag, and any common carrier, flying any flag, may invoke the provisions of that act to protect its legitimate interests. The record incidentally, establishes that foreign-flag carriers have invoked that act, and, moreover, that the Federal Maritime Commission has operated as a forum for hearing their grievances and issuing orders for their benefit as appropriate. On the other side of the coin, however, all carriers who engage in our trades do so, necessarily, subject to the provisions of the Shipping Act. And subject to the Shipping Act means more than merely not violating its explicit provisions. The history of the last decade or so has caused the Congress to add important amendments to the Shipping Act.

Of these are included the obligation of carriers in our foreign trades to file with the Commission and otherwise make public their schedules of transportation rates and charges. Hence, for the first time, the actual current rates of both inbound and outbound ocean cargo liftings are now matters of public record. Such rates cannot be increased, except by special permission for good cause shown, on less than 30 days' advance notice, and where such rates pertain to exclusive patronage contracts, the familiar dual rate contracts, they may not be increased on less than 90 days' advance notice. These requirements enable the shipping public to know at all times what their freight costs will be exactly, and permit them to plan their future sales and purchases with greater assurances to their actual costs.

A very important feature of the 1961 amendment is that section which gives the Commission the power to disapprove any freight rate which it finds to be so unreasonably high or low as to be detrimental to the commerce of the United States. Now, we know that our commercial exports are at a healthy level. But we are painfully aware of the increasing difficulty our own exporters are experiencing in laying down their goods in foreign markets at competitive prices. Mindful of the fact that the American enterprise is manufacturing finished goods overseas in ever-increasing numbers, nevertheless a comparatively small percentage of American manufacturers have braved the rigors or reaped the harvests of selling overseas.

Further, we all understand the commercial challenge facing us today. We must, to put it succinctly, either trade or fade. And we at the Federal Maritime Commission are duty bound to insure that freight rates, and equally important charges for accessorial services, do not impede or impair our ability to export.

It is irrelevant, under the terms of the Shipping Act, that tariff barriers and other artificial impediments, or inherent high costs or production in this country bar foreign sales. We are commited to insuring that commodities which can be sold overseas, goods for which there is a present demand and goods for which a demand can be created and nurtured, are not foreclosed from the opportunity to compete in market places throughout the world by reason of rates and charges that are unreasonable. There is a national policy to encourage "sell American", and the Federal Maritime Commission intends to do all in its power to contribute to that program. In a word, we intend to use our lawfully delegated powers to insure that American exporters and importers get as fair transportation treatment, from a service standpoint as well as from a price standpoint, as do their international competitors.

While the Commission's efforts in this area have met with some success, much remains to be done. Vessels of other nations carry an overwhelming amount of our liner commercial cargoes, as much as 75 percent. We have no desire to take cargoes away from any carrier or from any group. But we are concerned as we have a right to be, over the level of liner rates in all of our trades by all carriers who engage in them. And our concern has prompted in-depth cost studies involving our liner trades. Valid data have been exceedingly hard to come by, and require careful analysis before they can be used meaningfully. Yet the data which we have received have whetted our interest.

I think I can demonstrate why our interest has increased, why our efforts and resolve have been redoubled. Preliminary data covering the heaviest and most lucrative trade route, the North Atlantic European Continent trade, establish that the disparity spread between inbound and outbound freight rates is less than 7 percent in favor of the inbound.

In this trade there is no outbound dual rate system, and the conference carriers are faced with strong and well established nonconference competition.

Conversely, in the North Atlantic-United Kingdom trade, an equally important if not as voluminous a trade, and in many instances involving the same carriers, vessels, and voyages as the continental trade, where there is a dual rate system and where independent competition is not anywhere near the magnitude that it is in the continental trade, the freight rate disparity approaches 31 percent. And interestingly enough, in five of our major trades in 1963, inbound revenue tons exceeded outbound revenue tons by a substantial ratio.

In light of this, coupled with the fact that outbound rates are generally higher in these trades, can one honestly wonder why the Commission is so concerned with rate disparities? Let me give you another instance which is calculated to provoke concern. Of all the inbound trades to the United States, the trade from the west coast of Italy including Adriatic ports to U.S. North Atlantic ports is heavily proliferated with all manner of anticompetitive agreements. Oddly it is only in this particular inbound trade where the freight rate structure is actually higher than in the reciprocal outbound trade, which does not have anywhere near the same competitive restraints.

I have recited these instances to demonstrate that the Commission, in the discharge of its statutory obligation of insuring that freight rates are not unreasonably high or low to the detriment of our international commerce, has reasonable cause to pursue its legitimate interest in these matters.

By and large, I believe that the conferences have served our commerce well. Nevertheless, the very fact that their existence represents a substantial departure from the long established, preeminently successful free enterprise system of this country demands that conferences must be subject to constant Commission solicitude. When, at their own option, carriers and other persons subject to the act elect to do business in concert they neecasarily subject themselves to regulation. And for the Commission to properly fulfill its obligation it must be better informed.

Indeed, it must be fully informed and at all times. My own philosophy, not universally shared I must confess, is that anticompetitive agreements between carriers and between other persons subject to the Shipping Act enjoy an absolute immunity from our antitrust laws, that such anticompetitive agreements must be preapproved by the Commission, and that the carrying out of agreements before approval or after disapproval constitutes a violation of the Shipping Act alone. This philosophy, of course, casts a continuing burden of review upon the Commission. Further, the public interest standard of section 15, explicitly incorporated in the act in 1961, requires that the privilege of joint action must be conditioned upon the consequence of a public benefit.

In every regulated business, monopolies or quasi-monopolies are countenanced on the premise that their existence is necessary for the benefit of the public. Utility companies, transit companies, and even taxcabs fall into this category. Yet no one denies that the franchises of such entrepreneurs require countervailing safeguards administered by public bodies. So too, in my opinion, it must be where quasi-monopolies in the ocean transportation world are permitted. Obviously, the overwhelming share of our international trade is carried by vessels, and a predominant number of these vessels are devoted to our extremely important liner or general cargo trades, and the vast majority of these liners are banded together, lawfully, into rate-setting or price-fixing conferences. It is unthinkable, I contend, that in the 20th century, reasonable men would suggest that quasi-monopolies should exist without a public body's surveillance. In a word, the international commerce of the United States is far too important a matter to be placed, unbridled, into the hands of laissez faire business combines.

The plain facts are that our economy is freer than that of most of the international community, that our Government policy, in international shipping, involves less home-flag preference than does theirs and most importantly many nations in this hemisphere and abroad, have taken steps not only to protect and enhance their own international commerce, but have promulgated rules and regulations regarding the vessels on which commercial cargo must be carried. In the final analysis, the Shipping Act, as an expression of Congress pursuant to a constitutional grant, is designed for the protection and growth of our foreign commerce. Simply expressed the situation is this: our foreign commerce is open to all, and all those who wish to participate in it, do so under the ground rules that the Congress has laid down. Among those ground rules is the Shipping Act, and that is administered by the Federal Maritime Commission.

Carriers are free to engage or not to engage in our foreign commerce, but once having freely elected to participate in our trade they necessarily assume the obligations, as well as the benefits, which, under law is a condition of such participation. The phrase "unilateral regulation" has not been raised with respect to local pilotage rules, or to quarantine requirements or to health regulations, or to immigration requirements, or to contraband pronouncements.

I submit that the phrase is equally inane when it is applied to economic safeguards and in the final analysis the Commission's regulations, pursuant to congressional mandates, are economic safeguards. Further, those safeguards are rarely interposed except where normal commercial intercourse has already been the subject of private trade restraints.

I trust that I have made the point that the orderly, efficient, and economic flow of our international export and import commerce is of prime concern to the Federal Maritime Commission; that carriers of all nations and conferences are welcome to participate in our trades, while observing the spirit of the Shipping Act, and that the Commission intends to use its powers, without fear or favor, without recklessness or timidity, in meeting its public obligation.

Big Red 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Birmingham and of the Sixth District of Alabama, which I am honored to represent, have selected a most dramatic way to demonstrate their support of our military effort in Vietnam and the unfailing courage of our fighting men there. By official proclamation of Mayor Albert Boutwell, the city of Birmingham has adopted the 1st Infantry Division of the U.S. Army, more affectionately known as the Big Red 1.

Like so many other loyal patriotic Americans, the good people of Birmingham were disturbed and angered by the demonstrations and draft card burnings of a small misguided minority in this country—actions which have perplexed and even undermined the morale of U.S. Armed Forces engaged in a difficult and exhausting struggle thousands of miles from home. The citizens of Birmingham determined to show in a concrete and convincing way they were behind our men in Vietnam all the way.

The idea of "adopting" the 1st Infantry Division, now stationed in Vietnam, was first conceived by retired Brig. Gen. Edward M. Friend, Jr. It was an apt choice. The Big Red 1 is this country's oldest division and has an outstanding and much decorated history. It was first to shed American blood in France in World War I and first to land in North Africa in World War II. It sparked the conquest of Sicily, stormed across Omaha Beach in the D-day assault on Normandy, and was first in Germany with the capture of Aachen. The 1st Infantry Division also swept across the Rhine into Czechoslovakia—the farthest advance by U.S. troops in Europe in World War II.

The idea became reality through close and effective cooperation among the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Birmingham News, and the officials of the city of Birmingham. A special committee of distinguished citizens was formed by Mayor Boutwell to work on behalf of the city with the chamber of commerce. Those members are:

General chairmen: Mayor Albert Boutwell, Cooper Green. Cochairmen: Donald Stafford, Crawford Johnson III, Brig. Gen. E. M. Friend, Jr., USAR, retired.

Steering Committee: Tom Bradford, Miss Evelyn Walker, M. E. Hackney, John A. Jenkins, Dr. John Nixon, Dr. Lucius Pitts, Drew Redden, and Vincent Townsend.

The support of the Big Red 1 took tangible form at Christmastime when hundreds and thousands of gifts and letters were sent from Birmingham to men in Vietnam who would not be home for the holidays. That support continues and will continue as long as U.S. forces must remain in Vietnam to combat communism and defend freedom.

A Birmingham roll of honor has been organized, saluting organizations, companies, churches, schools, and other groups that have adopted units of the 1st Infantry Division. Here is the list of sponsoring organizations and the units of the Big Red 1 adopted by them, as of January 1, 1965.

Big Red 1 Roll of Honor

Alabama Bridge Association—1st Platoon "C" Co. 1st Engineer Battalion.

American Legion Post No. 35, Ensley—Headquarters Company 2–18 Infantry 1st Infantry Division.

Andrews Appliance & TV Center—701st Maintenance Battalion, Company "E".

Birmingham B. P. W.—Headquarters Company, Headquarters 2d Brigade.

Birmingham Holy Name Union—"B" Company 1–16 Infantry.

Birmingham Jaycees—Company "A", 1–28 Infantry.

Birmingham P.T.A. Council—Headquarters Company 1–28 Infantry.

Birmingham Real Estate Board—"A" Battery, 1–7 Artillery.

Birmingham Retail Druggist Association—Company "A" 1st Medical Battalion.

Birmingham Rotary Club—Headquarters Company 2–18 Infantry.

Brownie Scout Troop No. 159 and Junior Scout Troop No. 683—242d Chemical Platoon.

Boy Scouts, Troop No. 94, Vulcan—1st Platoon "A" Company 2–18 Infantry.

B'nai-B'rith—Headquarters Company 2–16 Infantry.

Birmingham Committee of 100 Women—Company "C" 2–2 Infantry.

Birmingham-Southern College—D Battery 1st–5th Artillery.

Birmingham Trust National Bank—"A" Battery 2–33 Artillery.

Birmingham Association of Life Underwriters—"C" Troop 1–4 Cavalry 1st Infantry Division.

Birmingham Labor Council—2d Platoon "C" Co. 1–1f Infantry.

Blach's—"A" Battery 1–5 Artillery.

Berry High School "Hope Club"—Headquarters Company 1st Brigade 1st Infantry Division.

Birmingham Elks Lodge No. 79—Headquarters and Service Battery 2–33 Artillery.

Communications Workers of America—A Company 121st Signal Battalion.

City Salesmans Club—C Company 1-28 Infantry.

City National Bank—266th Chemical Platoon.

Chapter No. 1 Licensed Practical Nurses—B Company 1st Medical Battalion.

Civitan Club of Birmingham—B Battery 1-7th Artillery.

Church of the Advent—B Battery 8-6 Artillery.

Downtown Optimist Club—3d Platoon, C Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Downtown Exchange Club—B Company 1st-2d Infantry.

Downtown Action Committee—Headquarters-Headquarters Company 1st Infantry Division.

Elton B. Stephens & Associates—Headquarters Company "A" 701st Maintenance Battalion.

Eastern Area Chamber of Commerce—1st Platoon "C" Company 1-18 Infantry.

East End Council of Garden Clubs—Company "A" 2-28 Infantry.

Ensley High School—Company "A" 2-16 Infantry.

Ensley Kiwanis Club—"B" Battery 1-5 Artillery.

First National Bank of Birmingham—"A" Company 1-18 Infantry.

Forestdale Lions Club—"B" Company 2-18 Infantry.

First Methodist Church—"D" Transportation 1-4 Cavalry.

City of Graysville—Headquarters Transportation 1-4 Infantry.

Grace Methodist Church—"C" Company 1-2 Infantry.

Hayes Management Association—Headquarters Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Homewood Lions Club—Company "A" 1-16 Infantry.

Huffman Business and Professional Women's Club—4th Platoon "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Independent Presbyterian Church—"A" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Insurance Women of Birmingham—Company "C" 1st Signal Battalion.

Irondale Methodist Church—"A" Company 2-18 Infantry 4th Platoon.

Jefferson County Sheriff's Department—1st Military Police Company.

Jefferson County Medical Society—Company "C" 1st Medical Battalion.

John Carroll High School—2d Platoon "A" Company 2-18 Infantry.

Kiwanis Club of Birmingham—Headquarters Company 1-2d Infantry.

Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668—Headquarters and Service Battery 1-5 Artillery.

Kelley Ingram VFW Post No. 668—Company "A" 1-2 Infantry.

League of Women Voters—Headquarters Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.

Liberty National Life Insurance Co.—Headquarters Company 1-26 Infantry.

Metropolitan Business & Professional Women—4th Platoon—C Company 1-18th Infantry.

Mountain Brook Jaycees—3d Platoon "A" Company 2-18 Infantry.

Mountain Brooks Lions Club—Headquarters Company 1-16 Infantry.

Mount Carmel Methodist Church—2d Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.

Mountain Brook Exchange Club—"A" Battery 8-6 Artillery.

Men of the Church, 76th Street Presbyterian Church—"C" Battery 8-6 Artillery.

Nu Ta Sigma Sorority—"A" Company 1st S. & T. Battalion.

Owens Cumberland VFW Post No. 3492—Headquarters Company 1-18 Infantry.

Parisians, Inc.—1-7 Artillery "C" Battery.

Phillips High School—"C" Company 2-16th Infantry.

Pizitz Department Store—Headquarters Company 2-2d Infantry.

Roebuck Business & Professional Women's Club Headquarters Battery 1-7 Artillery.

Ruhama Baptist Church—1st Military Detachment.

Ramsay High School—1st Company "B" Company 2-16th Infantry.

Roebuck Camera Club—Headquarters Battery 8-6 Artillery.

South Avondale Baptist Kindergarten—1st Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.

Sirote, Permutt, Friend & Friedman—3d Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.

Sertoma Club East—Headquarters Company High 3d Brigade.

Shades Valley Jaycees—1st Military Police Company.

Shades Valley Kiwanis Club—"C" Battery 2-33 Artillery.

Tarrant Rotary Club—"B" Company 1-26 Infantry.

Temple Emanu-El—"A" Troop 1-4 Cavalry.

United Steel Workers Local No. 1489—3d Platoon "C" Company 1-18 Inc.

University of Alabama Town & Gown Theater—4th Platoon "C" Company 2-28 Infantry.

Woodlawn High School—Company "B" 1-28 Inc.

Western Birmingham Jaycees—1st Aviation Battalion, "B" Company.

8th Avenue Branch YWCA—Company 1-16 Infantry.

Young Men's Business Club—Company "D" 1st Medical Battalion.

Zonta Club of Birmingham—Company "B" 121 Signal Battalion.

Gadsden has adopted the artillery brigade attached to the Big Red One, and Roadruck Tool Engineering Co. of Guntersville has adopted the 2d Platoon of "C" Company 1st Engineer Battalion.

Mr. Speaker, here is, I know, the real mood and spirit of America: resolute and eager to support the fight for freedom in Vietnam. I salute the action of the city of Birmingham in adopting the 1st Infantry Division and I hope that other cities and towns across this great country will follow its inspiring example and let our men in Vietnam know that the overwhelming majority of Americans support their stand for freedom and against tyranny there.

What's That You Said About High Taxes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Gastonia, N.C., Gazette of January 15, 1966, had a very fine editorial entitled "What's That You Said About High Taxes?"

The editorial points out that there is a definite relation between the taxes we pay and the standard of living we enjoy. I believe my colleagues will find the editorial to be most interesting, and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WHAT'S THAT YOU SAID ABOUT HIGH TAXES?

Some day when you don't have anything better to do, stand on the street corner and listen to the moaning.

It's a special, hybrid kind of moaning. It starts way down deep and rumbles up through the teeth and is spit out like the bitters of a pecan.

And what is it that prompts the moans?

Taxes, friend. Taxes.

"Why, I remember back a few years ago," the complaint goes, "when my taxes weren't half as much as they are now. And they're getting bigger and bigger."

And food, friend.

"Why, I can remember when we'd eat all week off $5."

So it was. But "back then," the week's menu consisted of black-eyed peas and cornbread, buttermilk, white beans, pintos, and maybe some fatback. Five bucks a week then was a king's ransom.

Now, check what the housewife brings home. Sixty-five different kinds of cereal, a like number of frozen foods—frozen, mind you; pickles by the quart, meat by the pound—all kinds of meat, mind you; rolls that melt in your mouth, doughnuts, buns and other bakery tasties that are products of today's bakery genius, and on and on and on.

Of course, food costs more today. And it will cost more tomorrow if we continue to demand and get that which is a little bit better, a little bit tastier.

But, getting back to taxes.

So yours went up with the revaluation. That's tough. So did ours. So did almost everybody else's we have talked with. And your taxes went up before that. And you just be dad-burned if you'll vote for a hospital if your taxes are going up again.

Well, bully boy for you. Maybe you should be allowed to return to those good old days when you lay with pneumonia in the "fire room" and the wind howled through the cracks and the heater's best wasn't half good enough to fight back the cold.

Maybe you want to call back the days of yesterday's hospital, with its feebly heated rooms in the winter and its sultry rooms in the summer. Maybe you liked the flies that collected around your bed or that stuck to the flypaper on the ceiling.

Maybe you'd rather stay at home and have a doctor come by to see you instead of being fevered down in a bed that cranks up and down and cared for by attentive nurses and resting with the thought that the best of medical knowledge is somewhere nearby.

"But my taxes * * *" you complain.

Your taxes. Of course, your taxes have gone up. But have you ever stopped to consider just how much your standard of living has skyrocketed during the same time?

Do you realize that your demands on your governmental representatives for more and more services, that your insistence for gadgets and convenience and a "better day" is directly responsible for your taxes being higher?

We don't deny that politicians held out the grapes; but it was you dear friend, who gobbled them up like selfish little foxes.

If you're interested in knowing what's been happening while your taxes were going up, stand at the bank teller's windows and watch the hordes go by. Maybe some of them will show you their deposit slips.

Or gather your courage and fling yourself atop a bridge over I-85 and count the shining, new cars as they hurtle their drivers along that tremendous ribbon of concrete which your taxes are paying for. (Remember "back when." Remember the dusty roads and the T-Model with the "gas" and "spark?")

Or, better yet, stand near the doorway of some furniture store and count the color TV sets as they're rolled out the back and into the waiting delivery trucks.

Taxes?

You can bet your life your taxes are up. But so are the luxuries you enjoy, the standard of living you cherish so much.

Brother, if you want something bad enough, you've got to pay for it.

Don't get us wrong. You should complain about your taxes. You are the conscience of the man who spends them. Let up, and he'll go hog wild.

But while you're complaining, just remember that there are two sides to the argument.

Tribute to a Modern Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when heroic deeds are being performed daily by our men in Vietnam, we have unfortunately witnessed too, occasional lapses of patriotism within the country. Therefore, it is especially appropriate that I now bring your attention to the truly loyal and dedicated action of one man in Quincy, Mass., who has established for himself and his community a tradition which should serve as an inspiration to all who learn of it.

Archie Vallatini has earned for himself the tribute I pay to him today, and I respectfully refer you to an article which appeared in the Boston Herald-Traveler of October 29, 1965. We are both proud and humble to see such exemplary citizenship in a naturalized American.

QUINCY SALUTES FLAG RAISER—HONORS DUE 76-YEAR-OLD PATRIOT

(By Henry Bosworth)

After 22 years, Quincy has finally caught up with Archie Vallatini.

And he's soon going to get what he deserves—citywide recognition.

Now a white-haired 76, Archie walks with the aid of a cane.

But he still gets up at sunrise each day to raise the flag of his adopted country to the top of a pole across from his Taber Street, south Quincy, home.

He's been quietly doing this since the middle of World War II. So quietly, it has been a virtual secret until now.

And during this time he has worn out an estimated 15 flags and 1 flagpole.

Archie, who came to America as a 13-year-old Italian immigrant in 1902, has voluntarily been hoisting Old Glory at a city war memorial because:

"I love my country. This is the best country in the whole world—you betcha life."

For the past week or so he has been sending up the flag with a little extra snap of the wrists still strong from his early years at a stonecutter. That's his reply to the recent draft card burning incidents.

"I don't want to say bad things about anyone," he shrugs. "But those boys oughta be ashamed. Maybe they should live in Russia for awhile. Then they'd be happy to have draft cards—you betcha."

Archie became a U.S. citizen in time to serve in the Army during World War I.

Married 46 years to the former Elizabeth Rosa, they have four sons and a daughter. Two of the sons, Frank and Archie, served in World War II. A third, George, saw service after the war.

Archie's flagpole, which actually belongs to the city, stands on a grass mall known as Liberty Square. Beside it is a handsome polished Quincy granite memorial with this inscription:

"In grateful tribute to the men and women who served our country to protect the cause of all freedoms. Erected 1951 by residents of Ward 3."

But the pole was there during World War II when residents put up a wooden tablet "Honor Roll" bearing the names of local boys fighting in that war.

At first, Archie took turns raising the flag with the janitor of the nearby Lincoln School. When the latter moved, Archie continued alone.

And unless the weather is bad he runs the flag up each morning and takes it down at sunset.

Archie helped raise the $2,300 for the granite memorial. He went door-to-door canvassing and helped in a wastepaper drive.

The campaign was launched by the local John Quincy Adams Club with Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, then ward councilman, as chairman and Alfred H. Mecagni, treasurer.

Now, long overdue recognition is coming to Archie.

Ward 3 Councilman John F. Koegler and Lawrence J. Perette, past commander and present public relations director of Quincy Veterans Council, found out about Archie simultaneously.

At their recommendation, the veterans council—representing 15 veterans posts—will appropriately pay tribute to Archie November 11.

He is being invited to be a member of the reviewing staff for the Veterans' Day parade. Then, as a head table guest at a dinner at Sherry's, Veterans Council Comdr. Henry J. Williams will present him with a special commendation.

But a couple of other nice things have already happened.

A 20-foot-high new flagpole is being erected by the veterans services department at Koegler's request to replace the old one now bent from service, weather, and kids swinging on the ropes.

And Anthony Famiglietti, custodian of city memorials, gave Archie a brandnew flag to replace the latest worn one.

Archie ran it up the other day to see how it looked. But he had a little trouble seeing it. Tears got in his way.

Monsignor John O'Grady

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

MONSIGNOR JOHN O'GRADY

The death of Monsignor John O'Grady, while it has brought sorrow to all who knew him, has also brought rejoicing in the triumphant conclusion of a splendid life. The nature of the man, and the value placed upon him by those who best knew his character and achievements, are well expressed in the editorial with which the Washington Post saluted his passing. Evidently speaking from the heart, the editorial writer began with the memorable exclamation: "What a glorious, triumphant, robust, and joyous Christian life came to a close when the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady died on Sunday." It is a strong temptation to make the eloquent words of this editorial tribute my own, as they compress so tellingly the many and varied contributions of this great man to America and to mankind, and carry over effectively to the reader the qualities of energy and compassion that made Monsignor O'Grady such a fighter for human needs and against injustice and intolerance.

Millions who have never heard of Monsignor O'Grady, and who presumably never will hear of him, are deeply in debt to his labors, and to those who have followed his lead. For more than 40 years he served with distinction as secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, holding the title of secretary emeritus at the time of his death on January 2, 1966. In this office, he was a major organizer of Catholic social welfare work both here and abroad, bringing both his scholarship and his boundless energy to bear on the many enterprises that came within the scope of this organization between 1919 and 1961, when he retired on account of ill health.

Even while carrying out the extensive duties of this position, Monsignor O'Grady became a founder of the National Catholic School of Social Work, in the Catholic University of America, and served as dean of that school from 1934 to 1938.

Monsignor O'Grady's was an effective voice in contributing to the study of legislation in social matters, since he combined the scholar's mastery of details with the executive's grasp of essentials. In housing, in social security, in employment of the physically handicapped, in nondiscrimination in employment, in immigration policies, in the resettlement of displaced persons, in the community approach to social welfare programs, Monsignor O'Grady has been a major contributor in the making of laws and in the establishment of government policy.

We who come of Irish stock take particular pride in the fact that Monsignor O'Grady was one of the great number of fine priests that have been contributed to America by Ireland. He was born in County Clare and ordained in Dublin, at his death he was survived by a brother living in County Clare, and a sister in Limerick.

Monsignor O'Grady's concerns and activities went beyond the borders of this country, not only in matters of the resettlement of refugees, and the liberalization of immigration laws, but in the far-flung benefactions of War Relief Services (later named Catholic Relief Services) of which he was vice president, and in his service as Consultant to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. In this capacity, he visited Africa to work on community development projects, and in 1959 he was cited by Pope John XXIII for his contributions to the welfare of Africa through this work. The Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, said, upon hearing of Monsignor O'Grady's death: "His influence on charitable works of the church in this country and throughout the world for widespread social reforms will be long remembered. He was truly a modern apostle of Christian charity."

Monsignor O'Grady's theoretical emphasis on community service was also carried out in his life. Despite his national and worldwide interests, in the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and in his services as a consultor to various branches of the U.S. Government and to the United Nations, he was active locally as organizer of the Catholic Charities of Washington, which he headed from 1920 to 1938, and as professor of sociology at Trinity College for many years, besides his continuing interest in the National Catholic School of Social Work.

A great priest, an outstanding American, a valued friend of mine for many years, Monsignor O'Grady was "One of God's Noblemen," during his many years of active, progressive, and constructive life. When things looked dark, Monsignor O'Grady was not only a bulwark of strength, but an inspiration to progressive Members of the Congress to fight successfully for the passage of progressive legislation in the best interests of the people.

We may well mourn that such a man has left us, but the occasion of his death is truly, in the long view, the occasion for rejoicing, both in the splendor of his Christian soul, and in the lasting benefits which his career has brought to our Nation and to the world. May his soul rest in peace, and may his example inspire generations yet to come.

In my remarks, I include the text of the sermon delivered by Most Rev. Raymond J. Gallagher, D.D., Bishop of Lafayette, Ind., at the Requiem Mass offered at St. Matthews Cathedral for

Msgr. John J. O'Grady and an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of January 5, 1966.

Tribute to Charities Pioneer

(By Bishop Raymond J. Gallagher)

With great wisdom Holy Mother Church encourages us to avoid the giving of a eulogy on the occasion of a person's death. This bit of advice is very wise since it enables those of us who are present for the ceremony to succeed in attaining the primary purpose of a funeral Mass, namely, a learning of the lesson which death itself teaches us.

Although the church recognizes the value of a life well lived, she endorses as more important the lesson of life taught by death. All of us have witnessed many times the entrance of death into our immediate circle under both tragic and ordinary circumstances. Regardless of how it arrives, attacking youth or old age, it presents us with a teaching unparalleled.

The recommendation that we consider the mystery of life and the inevitability of death provides an additional safeguard to both preacher and listener. By suggesting a relatively impersonal sermon, Holy Mother Church protects us from the caprice or unfortunate choice which a preacher might make among those qualities and characteristic possessed by the deceased.

CHURCH GUIDANCE

On the one hand, some might be selected and emphasized for personal reasons. On the other hand qualities of great significance might be neglected or ignored, presenting a final picture of the individual which is neither true nor balanced.

We can be grateful for this guidance and for the motif of the ceremonies here being performed since they enable us to focus on the true and basic identity of man and help us set a priority on those threads of relationship which typify us. By reason of the very simplicity of these ceremonies, we are reminded of the fact of our creation by God. We are once more complimented by the realization that God created us to help achieve His purposes. We are sobered by the realization that we must give an accounting of our stewardship in terms of what we have accomplished with what God has given us.

No one of us will question the wisdom involved here, for it provides us edifying and compelling encouragement to redirect and reform our lives while we yet have the opportunity. It reminds us of our distinct and precious identity as a being created by God's hand, a matter of proof that we are not the product of some accidental process, in reminding us that even though science, with magnificent competence, succeeds in developing life from primary ingredients, that we, as individuals, represent the miraculous existence out of nothingness which required a God to achieve.

This intimacy in sharing the mission of God among His creatures clarifies not only its importance, but identifies the warmth and affection with which we must pursue this godly objective of prosecuting the needs of our neighbor through love. The talents which God has given to each of us were meant as a means toward this end and our right to share in the perfection of God's company depends upon our use of these talents.

It is significant in the gospel story that the person who received the five talents put all five of them to the advantage of himself and his neighbor. Because of the striking similarity of our deceased friend and colleague to this utility of one's talents, as portrayed in the gospel, I am encouraged to depart from the advice of Holy Mother Church and become a little personal in this eulogy.

I have had the privilege of knowing Monsignor O'Grady for fewer number of years than most of you and I, therefore, anticipate your indulgence if I have not seen everything in proper perspective. What I say is a reflection of the manner in which he affected me.

Here was a man of God who combined many characteristics. He often told me that he was not popular with some of our Irish brothers because he didn't seem to dislike the English sufficiently. Although he was no less our ideal as both Catholic and Irish, he still preserved a sense of proportion that enabled him to love his brother regardless of other characteristics.

We have often characterized him as an opponent of what welfare theorists identified as dramatic new thrust in behalf of the poor. Even with this great motivation, our friend could preserve a balanced mind that measured the costs of these thrusts in terms of personal rights and duties. A man, a student, an educator, and a social reformer are but a few of the facets of his long and arduous priestly life.

He was indeed intense and dedicated, fearless, and courageous. He was blunt and direct, but it seems to me, only in order to dull those thrusts made by individuals or programs which would invade areas of critical importance to individuals, areas of responsibility, self-direction, self-sufficiency and freedom. He knew no equal in identifying those philosophies which would have reduced ourselves and our brother citizens to the stereotype of sameness, dependence, and thoughtlessness.

In retrospect, all of us will conclude that he was ahead of his time in ability to perceive and describe the impact of social change on the character of our Government and upon the lives of its citizens. He was a giant, physically and intellectually, and his tall shadow has been cast over the format of the Catholic charities movement in this country and over progressive social policy abroad.

If it is prudent to single out one goal achieved by this missioner of charity, it would be his contribution in making men in this country and abroad conscious of the inestimable value of self-sufficiency and self-direction. I suppose most of us chuckled and chided him at one time or another as he made the expression "self-help" a byword. As with all great characters, he persisted in his fight until this principle became an accepted device by which people help people and nations aid nations.

KEY TO EQUALITY

The importance of preserving a man's identity as resourceful where his own welfare was involved is today and will remain for many days, a key to full and complete establishment of equality among all people. With the same wisdom as the evangelist in the gospel story, he has taught us that the talents granted us by God are our most cherished possession, our birthright and our basis of admission to the courts of heaven.

It is remarkable what we learn about people as they live their life under changing circumstances. Under pressure Monsignor O'Grady lived with great courage, without fear of criticism, committed to the achievement of commendable goals. Under suffering of handicap and illness he revealed a capacity for humility and patience. Under the hand of God in the fullness of his human and priestly life and under the limits of increasing years and declining health, he has etched on our memories a portrayal of heroic resignation and acceptance of the will of God.

Perhaps Holy Mother Church will endorse my departure from the recommended practice since in the final analysis we have concentrated on characteristics, principles, values, and goals. Perhaps we will be forgiven this venture into the personal because it has demonstrated the successful manner in which one individual's talents have been placed at the disposal and for the improvement of many thousands, if not millions, of his brothers in Christ.

It remains for us who have had the privilege of observing the manner in which his talents were thus exploited to continue them in our own pursuit so that they become solid rules of life for us in the particular apostolate which now involves us.

One further permission I seek of you and I am sure you will grant it to me since we who are gathered here participate in individual ways of the family of charity developed by Monsignor O'Grady. As his associate and disciple, I consider it a privilege to thank some of those who have served him so well. To the sisters of Holy Cross at Dunbarton, to the Carmelite sisters at Carroll Manor, to Monsignor Coady and Archbishop O'Boyle, who have been his special guardian angels, I say a word of gratitude. To Margaret Coffman and Miss Alice Padgett who served him and loved him with great devotion, a simple expression of gratitude. To Jane Gallagher, may all of us be blessed with the affection, service, and devotion of a character as beautiful as yours.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1966]

Monsignor John O'Grady

What a glorious, triumphant, robust, and joyous Christian life came to a close when the Right Reverend Monsignor John O'Grady died on Sunday. Ordained in his native Ireland more than half a century ago when he was a lad of no more than 23, he became one of those priests whose whole life was a ministry, a consecration and a testament to the ideals of Christianity. Not for him the cloister. He was in the thick of every major social struggle of his time—and always on the side of the oppressed and the unfortunate, responsive always to suffering and to need, moved always by compassion and generosity.

He was one of the great innovators and developers of professional social service in the United States. Founder and dean of Catholic University's National Catholic School of Social Work, he served for more than 40 years as secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities. He fought for social security, for liberalization of the immigration laws, for enlightened aid to delinquent juveniles and to the indigent aged, for minimum-wage legislation, for interfaith tolerance and understanding and for a host of other measures designed to help his fellow man. He was a great lover of life and of humanity; and he will be mourned and remembered with love and with gratitude.

Mark Twain and the Copyright Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Edward G. Hudon, Assistant Librarian of the U.S. Supreme Court, which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1966. Dr. Hudon's remarks are most timely in view of Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's honorary sponsorship of "An Evening With Mark Twain," by Hal Holbrook, to be held on Monday evening, January 24, 1966, in the Department of State Auditorium.

Mark Twain and the Copyright Dilemma

(By Edward G. Hudon)

(Samuel L. Clemens was an inveterate and effective battler against the literary pirates of his time. Mr. Hudon, who has written on copyright history previously for the Journal, tells this story. He also recounts Mark Twain's efforts to have the copyright period extended and tells of his famous controversies with American publishers.)

The first copyright law, that enacted by the English House of Commons on January 11, 1710,[1] brought to an end the period of literary piracy among British publishers that followed the expiration of the licensing acts in 1695. It granted protection to authors and publishers by vesting the copies of printed books in the authors or purchasers of such copies for a stated period of time.[2]

In the United States the need for the same form of protection was recognized from the very beginning. Indeed, as early as 1785 the Continental Congress urged the several States to secure to the authors or publishers of new books the copyright of such books for a certain time, not less than 14 years from the first publication.[3] When the Constitutional Convention met in 1787, 12 of the 13 Original States had enacted copyright laws of one type or another.[4] Then, article I, section 8, of the Federal Constitution gave Congress authority "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right of their respective writings and discoveries."

Congress immediately exercised this authority by enacting the Copyright Act of 1790,[5] but both this statute and the State laws it superseded protected only citizens and residents of the United States. This situation continued for some time, although an international copyright movement was started early in the 19th century and immediately gained momentum, so that by 1854 all of the countries of the world (except the United States, Russia, and the Ottoman Empire) had adopted international copyright provisions based on reciprocity. The United States did not adopt an international copyright law until 1891.[6]

Meanwhile, in this country foreign authors were left to the mercy of literary pirates, and American authors suffered the same fate abroad. Thus, even though England adopted an international copyright law as early as 1838,[7] British authors continued to be pirated mercilessly by publishers in this country, and American authors received the same treatment at the hands of publishers in Great Britain. As between the two, the American publishers were the bigger pirates since there was more for them to steal.[8] So it is not surprising that British authors were louder and more persistent with their complaints.

But it was in vain that in 1837 the foremost British authors of the day gave vent to their grievances in the celebrated British Authors' Petition, which was submitted for them to the U.S. Congress by Henry Clay.[9] It was also in vain that Charles Dickens complained bitterly of the "American robbers," as he called American publishers,[10] and toured the length and breadth of this country in 1842 delivering lecture after lecture in which he preached the gospel of international copyright and pointed out the evils of literary piracy. American publishers continued to enrich themselves off Dickens, just as they had done earlier at the expense of Sir Walter Scott, whose works also were extensively published in this country without permission from or benefit to the author.[11]

MARK TWAIN AND THE BRITISH PUBLISHERS

Among American authors, Samuel L. Clemens was doubtless the most celebrated and certainly the most militant to espouse the cause of international copyright. He had more at stake than most of the others because of his ever-increasing popularity abroad as well as at home. For that reason, his motive was perhaps more practical than ideal. Nevertheless, once he became absorbed in the international copyright movement he never lost interest, and he had the good fortune to live to see the cause won and to share in some of the fruits of the victory.

But until Congress enacted the International Copyright Act of 1891, Clemens could not do much more than voice indignation as men like John Camden Hotten, one of the most enterprising of the British literary pirates, profited at his expense. For, no sooner had Clemens published "The Innocents Abroad" under his usual pen name of "Mark Twain" than it was pirated by Hotten.[12] The success of this venture prompted Hotten to pirate Clemens' "Sketches." This time, however, Hotten was not satisfied with simple literary piracy. Instead, he embellished and expanded what Clemens had written with pieces taken from the "Buffalo Express" and elsewhere, and he even attributed to Clemens the additional pen name of "Carl Byng." [13]

Quick to protest, Clemens wrote a letter to the editor of "The Spectator" in which he took Hotten to task as follows:

"Sir, I only venture to intrude upon you because I come, in some sense, in the interest of public morality, and this makes my mission respectable. Mr. John Camden Hotten, of London, has, of his own individual motion, republished several of my books in England. I do not protest against this, for there is no law that could give effect to the protest; and, besides, publishers are not accountable to the laws of heaven or earth in any country, as I understand it. But my grievance is this: My books are bad enough just as they are written; then what must they be after Mr. John Camden Hotten has composed half-a-dozen chapters and added the same to them? I feel that all true hearts will bleed for an author whose volumes have fallen under such a dispensation as this. If a friend of yours, or if even you yourself, were to write a book and set it adrift among the people, with the gravest apprehension that it was not up to what it ought to be intellectually, how would you like to have John Camden Hotten sit down and stimulate his powers, and drool two or three original chapters on the end of that book? Would not the world seem cold and hollow to you? Would you not feel that you wanted to die and be at rest? Little the world knows the true suffering. And suppose he should entitle these chapters 'Holiday Literature,' 'True Story of Chicago,' 'On Children,' 'Train up a Child,' and 'Away he Goes,' and 'Vengeance,' and then, on the strength of having evolved these marvels from his own consciousness, go and copyright the entire book, and put in the title-page a picture of a man with his hand in another man's pocket, and the legend 'All Rights Reserved.' (I only *suppose* the picture; still it would be a rather neat thing.) And, further, suppose that in the kindness of his heart and the exuberance of his untaught fancy, this thoroughly well-meaning innocent should expunge the modest title which you had given your book, and replace it with so foul an invention as this, 'Screamers and Eye-Openers,' and went and got that copyrighted, too. And suppose that on top of all this, he continually and persistently forgot to offer you a single penny or even send you a copy of your mutilated book to burn. Let one suppose all this. Let him suppose it with strength enough, and then he will know something about woe. Sometimes when I read one of those additional chapters constructed by John Camden Hotten, I feel as if I wanted to take a broom-straw and go and knock that man's brains out. Not in anger, for I feel none. Oh! not in anger; but only to see, that is all. Mere idle curiosity.

"And Mr. Hotten says that one nom de plume of mine is 'Carl Byng.' I hold that there is no affliction in this world that makes a man feel so downtrodden and abused as the giving him a name that does not belong to him. How would this sinful aborigine feel if I were to call him John Camden Hottentot, and come out in the papers and say that he was entitled to it by divine right? I do honestly believe it would throw him into a brain fever, if there were not an insuperable obstacle in the way.

"Yes—to come back to the original subject, which is the sorrow that is slowly but surely undermining my health—Hr. Hotten prints unrevised, uncorrected, and in some respect, spurious books, with my name to them as author, and thus embitters his customers against one of the most innocent of men. Messrs. George Routledge & Sons are the only English publishers who pay me any copyright, and therefore, if my books are to disseminate either suffering or crime among readers of our language, I would ever so much rather they did it through that house, and then I could contemplate the spectacle calmly as the dividends came in.—I am, Sir, &c

Samuel L. Clemens
("Mark Twain")[14]

"London, September 20, 1872."

One week after Clemens published his letter, Hotten addressed a reply to the editor of "the Spectator" in which he defended his actions and denied the accusations that had been made against him.[15] However, Clemen's letter did more than produce denials from Hotten and cause him to lose some of his boldness; it apparently also caused all British publishers to refrain from taking advantage of a flaw that existed in the copyright that Clemens obtained in Great Britain for "Roughing It." The copyright had been based on a provision of English law whereby a British copyright could be obtained for a book first published in the British dominions, whatever the nationality of the author, if he was a resident of the dominions at the time of publication.[16] "Roughing It" was first published by the London house of Routledge, it istrue, but although Clemens had been in London earlier to arrange with the Routledges for the future protection of his work, he was back in the United States when the book appeared.

Gratifying as it must have been to Clemens to have publishers in Great Britain respect his copyright for "Roughing It," this respect nevertheless led to an income tax assessment that was levied against him in 1887 by Her Majesty's internal revenue office. Clemens willingly paid the tax, but he took a different view of a receipt for his taxes that measured nearly a yard square and on which there was a considerable amount of postage due.[17] He wrote to his English publisher: "Look here, I don't mind paying the tax, but don't you let the internal revenue office send me any more receipts for it, for the postage is perfectly demoralizing. If they feel obliged to print a receipt on a horse blanket, why don't they hire a ship and send it over at their own expense?" [18]

Later in the same year he received another English tax assessment as the result of an erroneous newspaper report that he had leased Buckenham Hall, Norwich, for a year and would become an English resident.[19] Always ready to convert any situation into a literary production, Clemens used the assessment as the basis for an open letter addressed to Queen Victoria. He analyzed and dissected the "printed document the size of a newspaper" that the Internal Revenue Office had sent him to sign,[20] and he begged that of "justice" Her Majesty annul his letter in which, "in the confusion and aberration caused by the Document," he had ordered the tax paid. He concluded with the comment: "You will not miss the sum, but this is a hard year for authors; and as for lectures, I do not suppose your Majesty ever saw such a dull season." [21]

CANADIAN LITERARY PIRACY IRKS CLEMENS MORE

However irritated Clemens may have been by British literary pirates, he was even more

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

irritated by Canadian publishers who practiced the same art. Not only were his books pirated in Canada, but the cheap editions published there found their way to this country, where they competed with his own better and more expensive editions.[22] At times, this could cause him to become bitter, and nowhere is this more evident than in an unmailed letter which he wrote in 1887[23] referring to the U.S. Customhouse as a "fence," a "legalized trader in stolen goods"; the copyright law of this country as it then existed he called "nasty," "filthy," and "unspeakable." To his own question, "Whom does it (the copyright law) protect, then?" he answered, "Nobody, as far as I can see, but the foreign thief—sometimes—and his fellow-footpad the U.S. Government, all the time."

Apparently, his complaint was that to protect his own editions he would have had to pay duty on the 20-cent copies of "Roughing It" that the U.S. customs intercepted at the border before they would be released to him. He found the idea quite revolting—one in which he refused to participate—and he blamed the whole thing on "the departmental interpreters of laws, in Washington," who could, he wrote, "always be depended on to take any reasonable good law and interpret the commonsense all out of it."

Actually, at the time Clemens complained most bitterly about Canadian literary piracy, the Canadian copyright law was more liberal than was that of the United States.[24] The Canadian Act of 1875[25] required citizenship or bona fide domicile as did the law of the United States, and a book had to be printed and published in Canada. However, unlike the law of this country, Canadian law recognized the principle of reciprocity—it granted to other nations the same privileges that other nations granted to Canadians. Hence, American authors were deprived of the benefits of Canadian copyright only because there was no American provision for international copyright.[26] But from this it should not be assumed that American authors were completely without protection. There was still the British Imperial Act of 1842[27] which applied to Canada as well as to the other dominions. Clemens had already used this act to protect "Roughing It" in Great Britain. Its purpose was to further the interests of British publishers, and under it a copyright could be obtained for the entire British dominions for the work of an author, a resident of Britain, if it was first published in the British Isles. Once *Routledge* v. *Low* was decided in 1868,[28] residence anywhere in the British dominions, no matter how temporary, was all that was required of the author at the time of publication. Moreover, "publication" did not necessarily include printing. Therefore, all that an American author had to do to meet the requirements of the Imperial Act was to send to London 50 or so copies of his book that carried an English imprint, publish there 24 hours before he published in this country, and be in Canada (or anywhere else in the British dominions) at the moment of this first publication.[29]

A number of American authors availed themselves of the Imperial Act, which meant that their books could not be reprinted in Canada without their consent, but it did not mean that these books could not be imported there from abroad. Cheap editions could be and were printed elsewhere and the sheets imported on the payment of a 12½-percent duty, which was supposed to be for the benefit of the author.

---

[1] 8 Anne, c. 19 (1710).

[2] See Ransom, The First Copyright Statute (1956).

[3] 24 Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789, 326.

[4] For the texts of these acts, see Solberg, Copyright Enactments of the United States, 1783–1906. Copyright Office Bulletin No. 3 (1906).

[5] 1 Stat. 124 (1790).

[6] 26 Stat. 1106 (1891).

[7] 1 & 2 Vict, c. 59 (1838).

[8] Ferguson, Mark Twain: Man and Legend 161 (1943).

[9] See Solberg, Copyright in Congress, 1789–1904. Copyright Office Bulletin No. 8 (1905), 148, 149, 155, 156, 158, 159.

[10] Wilkins, Charles Dickens in America 237–238 (1911).

[11] 3 Cambridge History of American Literature 541 (1933).

[12] Ferguson, op cit, supra note 8, at 161–164.

[13] Ibid.

[14] The Spectator, Sept. 21, 1872, pps. 1201, 1202.

[15] Id., Sept. 28, 1872, p. 1237.

[16] See discussion of the British Imperial Act of 1842, infra.

[17] 2 Mark Twain's Letters, arranged with comment by Albert Bigelow Paine 492–493 note (1917), hereafter referred to as "Letters."

[18] Letter to Chatto & Windus, London, Dec. 5, 1887, 2 Letters 495.

[19] 2 Letters 493–494, note.

[20] Harpers monthly magazine, December, 1887, p. 157.

[21] Id. at 157–158.

[22] 2 Letters 479 note. See also 1 Letters 380.

[23] Unmailed letter addressed to H. C. Christiancy, Dec. 18, 1887, 2 Letters 479–482.

[24] See Dawson, "Copyright in Books: An Inquiry Into Its Origin, and an Account of the Present State of the Law in Canada" (lecture delivered before the Law School of Bishop's College, Sherbrooke, Quebec, Jan. 26, 1882).

[25] 38 & 39 Vict., c. 53 (1875).

[26] Dawson, op. cit. supra note 24, at 18 et seq.

[27] 5 & 6 Vict., c. 45 (1842).

[28] L. R. 3 H. L. 100 (1868).

[29] Dawson op. cit. supra note 24, at 23. See also, 1 Letters 431 note.

Realism Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been greatly blessed with many resources—but we have never asked that life be soft and easy. We have always asked that we be brave and strong and forthright enough to be realistic about what our problems—and our opportunities—might be. We have asked that we be given the facts, and calm heads with which to choose the road ahead. The facts are what the President gave to the people in his state of the Union address.

He could have been emotional. He chose to be realistic. He was realistic about his desire for peace and his determination to stand firm. He chose also to be realistic about the budget and other domestic matters.

Across the Nation editorials such as a recent one in the Baltimore Sun lauded the President's speech for its forthright appeal—his honest appraisal of the state of the Union. I ask permission to have the editorial to which I have referred reprinted in the Record:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Jan. 13, 1966]

The President's Speech

President Johnson laid out a realistic course for the Nation last night in his report to Congress on the state of the Union. He could not promise peace in Vietnam, but he could promise an honest effort to find a basis for peace. He aimed no new threats at North Vietnam but renewed his promise to stand firm against the Communist move to take over South Vietnam by force. He shows every intention of trying to keep the war under control, and in perspective, while the United States stresses its desire for a settlement on reasonable terms, and in this position the President deserves public support.

On the domestic side his handling of the budget and the related issue of inflation also seems realistic. His forecast of $112.8 billion in expenditures for the next fiscal year, after allowing for increases in defense items, indicates that he has carried out his pledge to hold down on nondefense items without sacrificing the continuing objectives of his Great Society program. If his forecast of $111 billion in revenues proves accurate—and it reflects an increase anticipated because of the rise in the gross national product—the deficit will be held to $1.8 billion without new income taxes. This would keep inflationary pressures within control and would be a mark of prudent management, all the more so in conjunction with his estimate that the deficit in our balance of payments for last year was down to $1.3 billion.

His proposals for new legislation—on the selection of juries and on crimes against civil rights workers, for a new Department of Transportation, for greater attention to the problems of the cities and pollution, for a 4-year term for Congressmen—will come into clearer focus after details are spelled out. The list is more modest than last year.

"I believe," he said, "we can continue the Great Society while we fight in Vietnam." He can expect wide support on both points so long as his approach continues to be realistic.

Irving Rivkin, Man of Principle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Commissioner Irving Rivkin, a close friend of mine and of my family, died last October, immediately after the adjournment of Congress. He was a model to our community as a husband, father, official of the city of New York, and as an outstanding practicing attorney. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an editorial and article from his hometown paper, the Staten Island Advance, which sums up the contribution that he made to our community and to our country:

[From the Staten Island (N.Y.) Advance, Oct. 25, 1965]

Irving Rivkin, Man of Principle

The death of Tax Commissioner Irving Rivkin has deprived Staten Island of a dedicated and uniquely conscientious civic servant.

Throughout his career, Mr. Rivkin was remarkably assiduous in defending his principles. As tax commissioner, he fought against what he considered unjust hiking of assessments on Island homes. Despite pressure from the commission's chief, he stuck to his guns and won considerable relief for property owners, as well as upsetting an arbitrary ruling the commission made which would prohibit anyone who sought a tax review from going to court later.

He was an indefatigable worker, and in 1960 personally reviewed more than 14,000 appeals for reductions of evaluations, touring the Island to see for himself the properties involved.

Mr. Rivkin was also an extremely loyal person. When the Herlands Commission trained its guns on his boss while Mr. Rivkin was an assistant district attorney, he remained steadfast despite others' advice to "lay off," and eventually won vindication. As law chairman of the county Democratic organization, regardless of his own feelings, he fought many election causes in court, and won most of them.

He set an example for those in politics and the practice of law—and for a new generation to follow.

[From the Staten Island Advance, Oct. 25, 1965]

TAX CHIEF IRVING RIVKIN DEAD AT 54

Tax Commissioner Irving Rivkin, 54, died in the emergency room of St. Vincent's Hospital yesterday morning, a half hour after suffering a heart attack in his home at 673 Pelton Avenue, West Brighton.

He attended Saturday night's annual dinner dance of the Banner Democratic Association at the Tavern on the Green, New Dorp.

Active in politics since he moved to the island from Queens in 1927, Mr. Rivkin first ventured into political controversy in the 1939 battle to unseat the then county Democratic chairman, the late William T. Fetherston. A member of the bar only 5 years at the time, Mr. Rivkin was chairman of the Coalition Democratic Movement, a resurgent group.

Mr. Rivkin was born in Columbia, S.C., and was brought to New York as a child. He graduated from Curtis High School, attended New York University and Brooklyn Law School, where he earned his master's degree in law in 1933. He opened a law office at 25 Hyatt Street, St. George, in 1934, from which he practiced law for 31 years.

In 1943, Mr. Rivkin represented the late Thomas J. Walsh in a successful fight for a recount to determine the victor in a tight election for the county judgeship against Thomas F. Cosgrove, the Republican candidate.

In the same year, he was named to the legal committee of the Democratic organization. He resigned his position 18 years later in disagreement with the county committee's failure to endorse Borough President Maniscalco and the then Surrogate John C. Boylan for renomination. With a change in the party leadership, he soon resumed his law committee chairmanship and served to the present.

He conducted a successful campaign during World War II to liberalize the State's absentee ballot system for servicemen.

Former Surogate Boylan named Mr. Rivkin confidential clerk in 1945, the same year in which the latter was named county chairman of the Affiliated Democrats of New York. Three years later, he was elected director of the Regular Democratic Organization of Richmond County.

The late District Attorney Methfessel appointed Mr. Rivkin assistant district attorney in 1951, a post he held until the defeat of Methfessel by Sidney O. Simonson the following year.

The names of Methfessel and Rivkin were in island headlines from September 1951 until August 1953 when they were accused of improper procedures in the arrest of Mrs. Anna Wentworth, of Concord. Mr. Rivkin fought the accusation and was exonerated by unanimous decision of the appellate division of the State supreme court in 1952.

District Attorney John M. Braisted, Jr., appointed Mr. Rivkin chief assistant district attorney in 1955, a position he held until he was sworn in as tax commissioner by Mayor Wagner in 1956. He was the first attorney to be appointed to the commission.

He first became involved in controversy as a commissioner in 1960 when he took sharp issue with a view of the State board of equalization and assessment that island real estate was underassessed. It was then he announced he intended to exercise the prerogative of a city tax commissioner to reduce assessments in particular cases.

In that year, he personally reviewed more than 14,000 appeals for reduced evaluations by island residents. He broke with Commission President William E. Boyland in March 1960, when he accused Boyland of brainwashing island assessors into considering speculative prices.

After the disastrous brush fire on the island's south shore in 1963, Mr. Rivkin campaigned for tax relief for homeowners whose property was damaged or destroyed in the fire. He personally visited hundreds of homes to witness the extent of damage.

In March of this year, he accused Boyland of trying to void tax reductions he had awarded as island commissioner. Mr. Rivkin awarded an estimated $2 million in property evaluation this year for about 2,000 applicants.

Mayor Wagner settled another controversy raised by Mr. Rivkin this year. The latter claimed that the tax commission president's requirement of "A" forms was illegal. The form would have required all persons seeking a consideration of their assessment to promise not to seek a court review. The mayor agreed with Mr. Rivkin after the tax commission had voted against the latter, 6 to 2.

Mr. Rivkin was elected president of the Livingston Heights Community Association three times, and had served as chairman of its board of directors from the association's inception in 1940.

He served more than 10 years as secretary of the convention of the second judicial department. He was a member of the Richmond County Bar Association; the board of directors of the Brooklyn Law School Alumni Association; the New York State District Attorney's Association; the Forest Avenue Board of Trade; Jewish Community Center and Staten Island Lodge of Elks.

He had also been special deputy attorney general in the election frauds bureau of the State law department; president of the Horker Benevolent Society and honorary president of the Men's Club of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, Tompkinsville.

Mr. Rivkin learned just 2 days before his death that his son, Robert S., of the home address, had passed the July New York State bar examination. The list was released Friday.

He is also survived by his wife, Sylvia; two daughters, Mrs. Myrna Lichtenstein of Merrick, L.I., and Miss Vivian B. Rivkin, a student at Ohio State University; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Rivkin, of Edgemere, L.I.; two brothers, Herbert, of Delafield Avenue, West Brighton, and Solomon, of Lynbrook, L.I.; a sister, Mrs. Evelyn Gofberg, of Malverne, L.I., and two grandchildren.

Rabbi Murray Kohn, spiritual leader of Congregation B'nai Jeshurun, was to conduct a service today at 2 p.m. in the Silvie Funeral Home, Port Richmond. Burial will be in Baron Hirsch Cemetery.

Tax Bite Explained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, across the country the public was somewhat surprised and disillusioned at the sizable increase in their social security taxes. The Pointer, an outstanding independent publication serving south suburban Cook County, Ill., produced a very timely and practical editorial explaining the impact of social security increases to its readers.

The editorial follows:

[From the Riverdale (Ill.) Pointer, Jan. 13, 1966]

TAX BITE EXPLAINED

Dolton, Riverdale, and South Holland residents found out this week that he who giveth also taketh away.

The year's first paychecks were noticeably lighter—and will be so most of the year—because of a sharp rise in the rate and wage base for social security. The increase, the 10th since social security was begun in 1937 at 1 percent of the first $3,000 earned, is the sharpest ever.

How big a bite? Last year residents paid $174 on the first $4,800 earned; this year those earning $4,800 will pay $201.60 and those earning more will pay up to $277.20. Further, the bite will be taken throughout the year; the old pay raise when the sum was collected will disappear for many people.

Not only is the employee being nicked, his employer is being nicked for the same amount; of your real wages, 8.4 percent or $554.40 is being paid into social security.

Bigger than taxes? In many cases, yes. Take a man earning $91.50 a week with a wife and four children to support; his tax bite is $104 a year but his social security bite is nearly double—$199.84. The same man earning $108.65 a week will find his tax bite is $223.60 but his social security bite is $237.30.

Why the increase? Surprisingly, only a small part is for the medicare program voted this year (although, if social security itself is any criterion, medicare will grow and grow). Most of the increase is needed to pay for extended benefits (7 percent across the board last year) and for the increasing number of eligibles.

Two forces have increased the number of eligibles and the demands on social security. For one thing, people live longer; the average life expectancy is near 72, yet Congress has almost annually lowered the age at which persons may become eligible. For another, Congress has constantly expanded the number of people—self-employed farmers, professional persons, while they are contributors, they are also recipients.

Congress can hardly be forgiven for its generosity, which is thinly disguised vote buying (election year Congresses have been notably generous in dispensing new and bigger benefits). But a rapacious public which clamors for more and more largesse from the system, such as medicare, can hardly complain when the piper's price increases as the tune gets more complex.

It is paradoxical indeed that the administration which pushed through tax cuts of all kinds (income and excise) to spur the economy is now strangling that economy with a necessary but expensive social security deduction hike.

The rapid and rapacious growth of social security can be seen in this table. Increases already on the books, or planned, will bring the rate to 5.6 percent on the first $6,600 or $372.90 by 1987; this sum must be matched by the employer for a total of $745.80.

Date	Rate	Wages	Maximum tax
	Percent		
1937	1	$3,000	$30.00
1950	1½	3,000	45.00
1951	1½	3,600	54.00
1954	2	3,600	72.00
1955	2	4,200	84.00
1957	2¼	4,200	94.50
1959	2½	4,800	120.00
1960	3	4,800	144.00
1962	3⅛	4,800	150.00
1963	3⅝	4,800	174.00
1966	4 2/10	6,600	277.20

Source: Statistical data from the Gage and Dale companies of Chicago.

Founding Convention of Hawaii State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1966, Congressman SPARK MATSUNAGA, of Hawaii, delivered a speech at the Founding Convention of Hawaii State Federation of Labor, AFL–CIO, in Honolulu.

I would like to share the thoughts expressed in this speech with my colleagues:

SPEECH OF HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA BEFORE FOUNDING CONVENTION OF HAWAII STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL–CIO, HONOLULU, HAWAII, SATURDAY, JANUARY 8, 1966

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is indeed a great honor for me to be here today, on the eve of the opening of the 2d session of the 89th Congress, and to share with you some of the thoughts which come to mind as you engage in the deliberations of this important convention.

The job for which you are assembled here is a monumental one, as you are well aware, but it also represents a significant milestone in the labor movement in Hawaii.

We know, of course, that the promotion or fostering of cooperative effort is a difficult task at best. If the various unions of the Islands can forget their differences, however real or imagined they may appear to be, and unite into a resolute federation as labor has done on the mainland, then real progress will be assured.

It has taken time, patience, and skill to bring this meeting together. The purpose and objectives in bringing a State federation into being must not fail.

Samuel Gompers, the man who brought the American Federation of Labor into being and who guided the federation through the sometimes brutal and tough years of formation until it was an established entity in labor's own behalf, was a great believer in cooperation. Gompers was more than aware of the value of the federation presenting a united front to the State legislatures in the States where the American Federation of Labor had the unions and the membership to be effective.

John L. Lewis, the founder of the CIO and leader of the United Mine Workers for three decades, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO and the United Steelworkers of America, both strongly stressed a united approach when dealing with State legislatures. Both of these men could relate some sad experiences they encountered in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through the tragic failure of a disunited labor movement in the Commonwealth.

Dan Tobin of the Teamsters, Dan Tracy of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, John Lyons of the Ironworkers, Dick Gray of the Building Trades Department, Al Hayes of the Machinists, and President George Meaney, who came out of the New York State Federation of Labor, can all attest to the crying need for a united labor movement within the various States.

In the days before the Wagner Act the employer completely dominated labor relations. Employees were forced to sign "yellow dog" contracts which bound them not to join unions. They either signed or got fired. Those who were fired often were blacklisted. Individual working men and women were helpless.

Despite such intimidation unions managed to emerge, but many employers refused to bargain with them. Management resorted to all sorts of tactics to break up unions: threats, intimidations, physical violence, use of spies, scabs, and strikebreaking detective agencies. State and Federal courts were asked to issue injunctions.

The decisive big step toward legal recognition of the rights of organized labor was section 7(a) of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933. This section affirmed the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing without interference, restraint, or coercion on the part of employers.

The next big step was the Wagner Act of 1935. It provided an agency, the National Labor Relations Board, to administer and to enforce the legal rights of labor. The law protected the right of working men and women to organize unions of their own choosing and to bargain collectively through those unions. It also set up election machinery for democratically selecting the bargaining representative.

Industry bitterly opposed the Wagner Act. The National Association of Manufacturers and leading corporation attorneys advised employers not to comply with the law because they claimed it was unconstitutional. When the Supreme Court in 1937 established the constitutionality of the Wagner Act in five separate cases, most employers grudgingly began to comply.

The NAM and reactionary employers began an intensive campaign against the Wagner Act. The campaign consisted of appealing slogans, half-truths, misinterpretation, and misrepresentation.

This campaign succeeded in deceiving part of the American public into believing that unions and labor leaders had too much power.

Strikes in a number of industries during 1946 and 1947 played into their hands. The Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 was the result of this campaign, with other factors playing a contributing role.

The major item of labor legislation in the 86th Congress was the Labor-Management Reporting Act of 1959.

The impact of this law, along with the so-called Taft-Hartley Act, has impaired the effectiveness of organized labor in many areas. It is generally conceded that the restrictions placed upon organized labor by this law have placed obstacles in the way of unions organizing the unorganized.

As we all know by now, our State legislature and the Congress can set terms for collective bargaining, can fix minimum wages and maximum hours, and can vitally influence working conditions. They can even determine whether there shall be unions.

It was Congress which outlawed the closed shop, and State legislatures which, in many States, outlawed the union shop. Nineteen States now have misnamed right-to-work laws.

Today, we are concerned with the direction our economy is taking. To the economists this is a matter of academic concern. To the building tradesman on the job site or the factory worker in the plant it is a matter of bread and butter, clothes, and shelter for himself and his family. It means the difference between meeting payments on his car or arguing with the repossesor, between meeting payments on the television set or watching it being toted out of the house.

What government policy is, and what it will be in the next few months, will hit each of us in the bread basket whether we like it or not. We may agree or disagree with the theory that government should or should not exercise control over economic policy, that it should be left to the businessmen. Whatever theory we hold, the inescapable fact of life today is that government does determine economic policy and thereby the amount of food in the family pot.

Nor is our Government some vague group of people called "they." It is composed of men and women elected to public office for specified periods of time by each citizen who avails himself of the right to register and vote. (I can vouch for the specified time—which is 2 years for Representatives to Congress, and which means that before too long you will be hearing from me.) You prosper or struggle depending upon their wisdom, foresight, prejudices, and capacity.

Sometimes I hear trade union people tell me that, through their trade unions, they can set rates and determine conditions that will affect the lives of their members and that is the limit of their responsibility as trade unionists.

I don't quarrel with that statement. There is nothing wrong with self-interest. It may be—although I doubt it—that there was a day when this was so, but it is emphatically not so today. The trade union movement is composed of 18 million members in a sea of upward of 186 million people in the United States, and more than 2 billion people in the world. We cannot live our lives apart from them, nor are we pursuing that course as a nation in the world today.

As President Theodore Roosevelt stated: "When a band of 150 or 200 honest, intelligent men, who mean business and know their business, is found in any district, whether in one of the local organizations or outside, you can guarantee that the local politicians of that district will begin to treat it with a combination of fear, hatred, and respect and that its influence will be felt."

Trade unions are instruments intended for the improvement of the welfare of its members. When so much of the welfare of your members is determined in the field of politics and government it is impossible for trade unions to ignore it. That is why we must have in Hawaii a united federation of all the unions on the islands which will stand ready and able to see to it that when labor speaks in Hawaii it does so for all labor, and not just one or two unions.

The record of Congress, though not the 89th in its 1st session, reveals many attempts to restrict the rights of our trade unions, and the same is true of many of the State legislatures, though, thank God, those conditions don't apply in our State of Hawaii. But we must remember that eternal vigilance is not only the price of liberty, but also the price of true progress.

A strong united federation of all the unions in Hawaii can and will make a real contribution not only to all union members, but also to our growing State and our Nation in this difficult and changing era upon which we are now entering.

I thank you for your invitation to be here today, and I wish you every success in your endeavors for a strong united trade union federation in our own State of Hawaii.

Thank you very much.

Flexible but Firm Viet Policy Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the first major issue facing the Congress this year is the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It seems to be the No. 1 topic of discussion in the Nation.

The American people desire peace for Vietnam, but they want a just and honorable end to the tragic war which is costing so many American and Vietnamese lives.

In the New York Times, January 18, there appeared a thought-provoking article stressing that we must be firm as well as flexible in our peace plans, that our actions will have far-reaching effects. It pointed out that the recent escalation of the Vietnam conflict stems from U.S. failure at the Bay of Pigs. Because of the timeliness of this reminder by Associate Editor James Reston, I take this opportunity to include the article in the Record.

Reston Criticizes United States Over Vietnam—Says Kennedy-Khrushchev Talks Led to War Stepup

James Reston, an associate editor of the New York Times, said last night that the United States "got off the track" in Vietnam in the spring of 1961 as a result of Nikita S. Khrushchev's attempt to bully President Kennedy when the two met in Vienna.

In an interview conducted by Paul Nive and broadcast on the National Educational Television Network, Mr. Reston said Mr. Kennedy had told him that he thought the bullying by Mr. Khrushchev, then Soviet Premier, was a result of the "Bay of Pigs fiasco," the ill-fated, U.S.-backed attack on Cuba by anti-Castro exiles.

President Kennedy, Mr. Reston said, told him that he thought Mr. Khrushchev had decided that "anybody who was stupid enough to get involved in that situation was immature, and anybody who didn't see it all the way through was timid and therefore could be bluffed."

According to Mr. Reston, President Kennedy then said that it was necessary to take steps to make U.S. power "credible" to the Russians.

A DIPLOMATIC POINT

Therefore, the military budget was increased, the Rainbow Division was sent to West Germany and the war in Vietnam was intensified, "not because the situation on the ground demanded it in Vietnam," according to Mr. Reston, but because Mr. Kennedy "wanted to prove a diplomatic point, not a military point.

"That, I think," Mr. Reston declared, "is where we began to get off the track."

Mr. Reston asserted that the war in Vietnam should be pursued as one of limited objectives, that the correct way was "the middle way." This, he said, would rule out both continued intensification of the war or peace on terms that would lose the country.

The United States can defend the perimeter of Saigon, Mr. Reston said, and the coastal areas where most of the people of South Vietnam live. This is very different, he added, from searching out the enemy through the elephant grass.

"We are just at the beginning of an enormous battle of Asia," Mr. Reston said. "That battle will go on for the rest of the century and Vietnam is not the end of it but the beginning. If we win in Vietnam, the battle will still go on and what I am afraid of is that we will try to score a great smashing victory, thinking that will end it all, which it won't.

"Therefore, I would limit the objective," he declared.

The interview with Mr. Reston was telecast in New York over station WNDT, channel 13, at 7:30 p.m.

Peace at What Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following column by Robert G. Spivack which appeared in the January 4, 1966, edition of the New York Journal American. The article poses questions which must be answered before there can be peace in Vietnam.

One of the most important questions is whether Ho Chi Minh will agree not to try to overturn the Government of South Vietnam which its people determine they want for themselves.

Whether we can trust an agreement is something to worry about if and when we get the agreement.

The article follows:

Peace at What Price?

(By Robert G. Spivack)

Discounting the revolutionary rhetoric and leaving aside the personal rivalries that have developed among the Communist factions in Vietnam, there is still another serious obstacle to preliminary peace negotiations.

The problem is how to convince the rank-and-file on both sides that "peace" and "surrender" are not the same.

Among the non-Communist elements supporting the South Vietnamese Government there is anxiety that after all these years of fighting they will be abandoned to the tender mercies of the Vietcong.

The Communists in the South, on the other hand, have persuaded themselves after two decades of conflict that all is about lost, that their struggle will have been in vain, and that their comrades in the North, frightened by the U.S. bombings, plan to sell them out.

These are emotional dilemmas, not easily resolved.

To understand how the Communists have painted themselves into a corner one need only read Ho Chi Minh's recent frenzied letter to Pope Paul. Granted that he has to talk a tough line because of increasing, but still subterranean criticism, from the Vietcong—the letter still shows the kind of political paranoia that results from years of war and revolution.

The United States, he wrote, has in 6 years "committed monstrous crimes." He proceeds to give a list of figures that bear no resemblance to any verifiable facts. The United States has established "a regime of fascist dictatorship." Even the "strategic hamlets," a noble effort to protect the Vietnamese peasant while encouraging his sense of self-reliance, are described as "a kind of concentration camp."

Although he is aged and rigid, Ho is supposedly one of the more reasonable of the North Vietnamese Communist leaders. Yet if his letter to the Pope has been broadcast also to his own people, how can he turn around and tell them that he is prepared to sit down with the "fascist" beasts and negotiate?

Even though the letter probably was written before President Johnson's new peace blitz, if Ho were abruptly to reverse positions he would open himself to the very charge that he seeks to avoid, that he would sell out the Vietcong in order to protect the cities and industry of the North.

To a lesser extent the same problem exists on our side of the conflict.

Premier Ky is said to oppose all the "peacemongering" lest it bring down his government. He seems to have done a fairly decent job since taking power and so far as we know there is no one with any popular following to substitute for him.

But our commitment is not so much to the Ky government as it is to protect the South Vietnamese from political reprisals, terror, and all the inevitable consequences that would ensue if we were to leave the country now or in the foreseeable future.

For these reasons—to calm this emotional ferment—it would be advisable if the administration were to spell out once again, but in some detail, just what kind of settlement we envision in Vietnam. We have already said we do not aim to overturn Ho's regime although he hasn't said the same for the South.

Latin Reds Set To Hike Guerrilla War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as emphasized by me on many occasions, the significance of Cuba in the current Red revolutionary drive for Caribbean conquest is its location on the northern flank of the Panama Canal approaches from the Atlantic. Not only that, this island has become a training base for training infiltrators for the overthrow of the governments of other Latin American countries.

An informative newsstory on revolutionary activities in Cuba and their impact in Latin America follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Jan. 10, 1966]

Latin Reds Set To Hike Guerrilla War

(By Virginia Prewett)

The tricontinental conference of leftist parties in Havana has produced two significant results so far.

First, it has provoked strong condemnation from democratic Latin American governments.

Second, it has revealed how the Moscow-line Communists mean to wage their struggle with the Peiping-line Communists in Latin America.

ISSUES WARNING

Venezuela's President Raul Leoni warned as the meeting opened:

"Venezuela considers that the tricontinental conference presages new aggression against the internal peace of the democratic countries of Latin America. Aggression is in fact the precise objective of the conference."

Carlos Andres Perez, parliamentary leader of Venezuela's ruling Democratic Action Party, criticized the Organization of American States for its "want of concern and lack of action" in face of the Havana Conference.

A former Minister of the Interior, Senor Peres is spoken of as a possible candidate to succeed Dr. Leoni in the presidency.

From Peru a warning—from Gen. Carlos G. Morau, head of Peru's War College—that the tricontinental meeting means to relieve pressure on southeast Asia by opening a front that threatens the U.S. southern flank.

Peru's President Fernando Belaunde Terry, who denied the existence of guerrillas in Peru till 6 months ago, assailed Cuba for exporting subversion.

At the meeting, the Castro regime and the Latin American delegates present have expressed a fierce determination to increase the Communist armed struggle against existing governments.

Due largely to its dependence on Moscow for arms and economic help, Havana today follows the Moscow line and is using the conference to try to gain control of the Communist movement throughout Latin America. At the Havana meeting, Castro revealed the strategem which he means to use to do this.

STRATEGY LISTED

Havana's strategy is to preempt the left. At the Havana meeting Castro made it plain his Moscow-backed Communist drive means to capture and hold what has been the main Chinese line in Latin America—emphasizing guerrilla warfare.

Castro has always been personally addicted to violent revolutions. Yet as Moscow and Peiping grew apart on ideology and began to compete for spheres of influence—and especially since Castro put the pro-Peiping "Che" Guevara out of the Cuban picture—it has even been hoped in some U.S. circles that Havana would let up in its subversion in Latin America.

The tricontinental conference has put an end to that hope.

State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's annual state of the Union message commands the attention of all Americans and all the world. We have already seen and heard many statements and comments concerning the President's report on the war in Vietnam and, to the great surprise of many observers, his many new recommendations for domestic legislation. Because of the gravity of the decisions which the second session of the 89th Congress will face in the coming months it is of particular importance to have the fullest canvass of the reactions to the President's program.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and in keeping with my responsibility to give the views of the district which I serve their proper hearing in Washington, I wish to make a part of the RECORD the views of the three daily newspapers situated in Michigan's Sixth Congressional District. These include the editorial appearing in the Friday, January 14, 1966, issue of the State Journal, of Lansing, entitled "Johnson's New Plans Raise a Question"; the statement of the editors of the Jackson Citizen Patriot of Friday, January 14, 1966, entitled "Johnson Again Is All Things to All People"; and the editorial entitled "One Decision Will Govern the Others," of the Owosso Argus Press of January 17, 1966:

[From the Lansing (Mich.) State Journal, Jan. 14, 1966]

JOHNSON'S NEW PLANS RAISE A QUESTION

In his annual message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Johnson voiced two major determinations.

One is to keep U.S. military forces in South Vietnam until aggression against that country has ended.

The other is to not only press forward but also to expand the programs he believes are needed to build what he conceives to be a Great Society.

In expressing the latter determination, Johnson gave his answer to those who take the view that the Nation should not simultaneously have to bear the costs of the war in Vietnam and the Great Society programs at home.

To the President it isn't a case of having to make a choice between "guns and butter." In effect, he expressed confidence that the United States can afford all the guns that are needed to defend freedom and all the "butter" that he believes the American people should have in other areas.

Giving Congress a brief preview of his budget for fiscal 1967, Johnson said total spending will be $112.8 billion with revenues estimated at $111 billion, resulting in an estimated deficit of about $1.8 billion which he said would be "one of the lowest in many years."

The Chief Executive recommended a series of tax changes to meet increased military costs in Vietnam and to support domestic spending.

Johnson called for increased tax withholding from paychecks, temporary restoration of automobile and telephone excise taxes, which were reduced only a few days ago, and a speedup in the collection of corporate taxes.

Some of the legislation he proposed would substantially expand the already extensive role of the Federal Government in the affairs of the States and local communities.

In this category were an urban rebuilding program "on a scale never before attempted" to reconstruct entire central and slum areas in some cities, a Highway Safety Act "to seek an end to the destruction on our highways which kills 135 Americans every day," and action "to attack the wasteful and degrading poisoning of our rivers, and, as the cornerstone of this effort, clean completely entire large river basins."

President Johnson's message on the state of the Union was in large part a report on the state of the war in Vietnam to which this Union is committed.

"The enemy is no longer close to victory," Johnson said. "Time is no longer on his side. There is no cause to doubt the American commitment."

"We will stay," he said, "because a just nation cannot leave to the cruelties of its enemies a people who have staked their lives and independence on our solemn pledge—a pledge which has grown through the commitments of three American Presidents.

"We will stay because in Asia and around the world, are countries whose course of independence rests, in large measure, on confidence in American protection. To yield to force in Vietnam would weaken that confidence, undermine the independence of many lands and whet the appetite of the aggressor. We would have to fight in one land, and then another, or abandon much of Asia to the domination of the Communists."

President Johnson accompanied his statement of determination to stay in Vietnam until the aggression has stopped with a pledge to continue a vigorous search for peace through negotiations "at any conference table."

In addition to defending the independence of Vietnam, Johnson said that this year he is proposing major new directions "in our program of foreign assistance to help those countries who help themselves."

He said the United States will "conduct a worldwide attack on the problems of hunger, disease, and ignorance" and that, to advance these ends, he will propose an international education act of 1966 and an international health act of 1966. "In the next year," he said, "we propose to dedicate $1 billion to these efforts."

The President thus made clear an intent to use more U.S. resources to help build not only a Great Society at home but also a great global society.

His aspirations in this regard doubtless will receive widespread praise. The question is whether America can afford in the years ahead to expand its role as Lady Bountiful and at the same time serve as a policeman in protecting the independence of a large part of the world.

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, Jan. 14, 1966]

JOHNSON AGAIN IS ALL THINGS TO ALL PEOPLE

Christmas is nearly 3 weeks past, but President Johnson lighted another tree in his state of the Union message Wednesday evening.

In the best of the Yule traditions his report to Congress had something in it for everybody, not only in the United States, but in the whole wide world.

He even included a major portion of his prime audience on the gift list by asking 4-year terms for Members of the House of Representatives.

The bad news, such as it was outside the Vietnam situation, was administered in tiny doses. The worst shock, perhaps was his hint that restoration of excise taxes on automobiles and telephones might be sought.

As President, Lyndon B. Johnson obviously loves a consensus. He wants the vast majority of the American people cheering him on and telling him what a great guy he is and how brilliant are his ideas.

And so, again, he tried to be all things to all people.

The war in Vietnam, he assured the Congress and the American people, will be prosecuted as the need arises while great efforts are made to achieve an honorable peace. He spoke of sacrifices and of this Nation's commitment to a policy of opposing oppression. All of which is right, proper and in the American tradition.

But he insisted that the war will not interfere with his Great Society programs enacted last year, or with the expansion of them in the future.

While he gave lipservice to economy he overlooked a fear which is prevalent, even among some members of his own party: That the legislation adopted so hastily in 1965, is partially unworkable and is certain to become tremendously expensive.

Congress, even including many members and leaders of the President's own party, is in a mood to reevaluate the Great Society, to concentrate on correcting errors which may have been made, and to take on new projects only with considerable caution and a long, hard look at the costs.

The President apparently will have none of that.

He gives Congress and the people assurance that the economic strength of the United States is so great that it can carry on the war on whatever scale is called for, continue to extend its largess to nations all around the world and add billions to spending on domestic functions.

True, the President has going for him a boom of unprecedented strength and duration. The prophets of doom have been proved wrong by the business and labor statistics.

Moreover, many of the objectives outlined in his state of the Union message are worthy. Among these are bold action to reduce crime, modernization of the executive branch of Government, attacks on air and water pollution, increased efforts to find the answers to the riddle of highway safety, and the creation of a new Cabinet-rank Department of Transportation.

But listening to, or reading, the President's speech you can't avoid a feeling that he proposes the spending of money just because it is there—or may be there—or can be borrowed.

The President can claim that the 1965 session of Congress was the most productive in history from the viewpoint of new legislation placed on the books, breakthroughs in programs which have been waiting around for years, and the commitment of the Government to the spending of money.

Such a productive session of Congress should be followed by a sober evaluation of what has been done, an examination of the results of the legislation passed and a new assessment of the costs.

This would be a good time to do that. And the possible demands of the Vietnam war make it not only timely, but wise.

If the President has his way, the Nation will not hesitate for a second look at what it is doing. It will plunge ahead with vast increases in spending and will live in the hope that the boom will last from here to eternity and that nothing really serious will happen in southeast Asia.

[From the Owosso (Mich.) Argus-Press, Jan. 17, 1966]

ONE DECISION WILL GOVERN THE OTHERS

Only the coming weeks will tell whether President Johnson has effectively forestalled the gathering opposition in Congress to any expansion, or even a continuation on the present level, of spending on domestic programs in the face of military demands in Vietnam.

This Nation is strong enough and rich enough, he made clear, to meet its obligations both at home and abroad with but a moderate reinstatement of certain taxes and a modest budget deficit.

If things don't get worse in Vietnam, that is, which many will counter is more a probability than a possibility.

But if it comes to a choice between guns and butter, the President told the Congressmen forcibly, the sacrifice ought not to be asked of those who have difficulty in winning their daily bread, let alone something to spread it with.

His projected deficit of $1.8 billion, when compared with those the Nation is used to, deserves the adjective "only." But a projection is not a fact, and budget estimates at the beginning of a year have seldom borne much similarity to the final report.

Aside from the issues of getting and spending, the President has outlined a whole new set of specifications pertaining to the building of the Great Society.

For those who wondered what the overworked 89th Congress would find to occupy itself with in its 2d session, there are his proposals for a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation, a Highway Safety Act, and a constitutional amendment extending the terms of Representatives to 4 years.

This last is assured of quick passage in one of the two Chambers and extended debate in the other.

The noble-sounding International Education Act and International Health Act, which the President did not detail, also promise to provide much meat for legislative cooking.

The President proposes and Congress disposes. In the past 2 years, with a topheavy Democratic majority, the one has followed the other with unaccustomed alacrity.

Whether this process is repeated in 1966, however, may depend not so much on the will of President or Congress in Washington but what certain other men do in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

For 1966 looms as the year of decision in Vietnam, and it is that decision that will govern all others.

The Memoirs of Senator Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress is back in session, I take pleasure in noting the timely publication of the book, "The Memoirs of Senator Brown, a Capitol Cat," as told to Frances Spatz Leighton. Senator Brown, who resides at the Woodner Hotel, is Washington's only independent mouser, and is an advocate of such legislation as a Caticare-Veticare program. He is also passionately in favor of the establishment of a Cat Cultural Center, and believes that a mouse should be the first living creature sent to the moon to investigate certain persistent rumors that it is made of green cheese. Senator Brown originally comes from Montana, and is a descendent of a traveling bobcat and a worthy domestic. He presently lives with his loyal retainers, Reuben and Dorothy Fine, together with his legislative assistant, Blackie, and his AA, Alexander the Great. I have heard rumors that he has an unusually attractive secretary, Kitten Galore, whose parents have been nominated for the Nobel Prize for architecture.

Senator Brown, since arriving in Washington, has shown his political acumen by specializing in that most important Capitol concern: status. His publishers, Fleet Publishing Corp. of New York, describe his book as "the ultimate inside guide to Washington, D.C." The tasteful illustrations, described as "Senator Brown's Status Wall," show our President with his dogs, the Vice President's cat, and a number of Washington personalities with their illustrious retainers.

Washington life, as recorded in these memoirs, is not without its lighter side. Anecdotes, both true and aprocryphal, are recorded of the adventures of Congressmen, Senators, and Cabinet members. There are also certain indirect references, possibly satirical in tone, to lobbyists, social climbers, tax collectors, and members of the press. I particularly commend to Members, Senator Brown's "All Purpose Political Speech" and Senator Brown's "First Press Conference."

Frances Spatz Leighton, whom Senator Brown wisely chose as his ghost writer, originally comes from Geauga County in Ohio. She is a writer of many talents, and has worked with other notables and celebrities on memoirs of the Washington scene. Her coauthored books include "White House Chef," "My 30 Years Backstairs at the White House," "I Was Jacqueline Kennedy's Dressmaker," and "They Call Her Ladybird." She also recently edited a short book, "The Johnson Wit." Look, a New York pictorial magazine of popular nature, has described her as "Washington's classiest ghost" in its "Offbeat Guide to Washington." She is Washington editor of This Week, and other periodical publications.

Included in "the Memoirs of Senator Brown" are words and music of two of her songs, written especially for Senator Brown, "Fling Yourself on the Windowsill," and "Senator Pussycat." I am told that Senator Brown has asked Miss Leighton to write a musical play based on these memoirs.

Senator Brown, as is common with many here in the Capitol, has tried his hand at writing a regular series of reports to the folks back home. A chapter of his book, devoted to these "Mewsletters," embodies much homely wisdom. All in all, I wish to put on record that Senator Brown's view of life in Washington offers a suitable, lighthearted guide to the practical side of political life: how to get elected, how to establish residence and offices, how to deal with the press, and, particularly, how to get on with animals. After all, as the philosopher said, "Man is a political animal."

Why the Silence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Vietnam war, together with the protests, demonstrations, and marches here in this country, is foremost in our minds, it seems to me that the editorial from the San Mateo Times of Monday, January 17, raises a very pertinent question. This question, so far as the public prints are concerned, has not been answered by those who have taken the trouble to demonstrate. The editorial follows:

[From the San Mateo (Calif.) Times, Jan. 17, 1966]

WHY THE SILENCE?

Singularly silent during President Johnson's peace offensive are those critics of U.S. policy who marched, picketed, harangued, and otherwise pleaded for a halt to the fighting in Vietnam.

If the professional peaceniks, dedicated pacifists, and their followers of varying sincerity have been firing off wires urging negotiation to Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow, they have given no public notice of the fact. Considering their previous predilection for publicity, any such omission—due either to oversight or modesty—seems inconceivable.

One clue may be found in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's report on the wave of protest that passed through college campuses last fall and culminated in the November 27 march on Washington. The Communist Party, according to the FBI report, sent a directive to all districts giving instructions on slogans to be used.

If hatred of war—and not a desire for a Vietcong victory—motivated the instigators, they ought to be as busy now. They ought to be loading the cables to points east urging acceptance of an armistice.

They are not. And only the naive and gullible will wonder why not.

What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, Miss Mimi Hart, a senior at Lancaster, Ohio, High School, has written a perceptive essay, entitled "What Handicapped Workers Are Contributing to My Community." She wrote with understanding and clarity about a subject that deserves public notice. More than that, she cited case histories of individuals who, though handicapped, are leading productive lives.

Miss Hart was 1 of 10 winners in the "Employ the Handicapped—Ability Counts" contest sponsored by Fairfield Unit No. 11, American Legion Auxiliary. I commend all the winners.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD the text of the essay by Miss Hart:

WHAT HANDICAPPED WORKERS ARE CONTRIBUTING TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Miriam Hart)

In recent years, the handicapped person has become socially accepted. The physically and mentally disabled of our community have, through their own determination, been able to lead normal lives as citizens in our society. The handicapped person is no longer looked upon with sympathy, but with the respect and admiration that he deserves. He has worked himself up to a degree of equality with others.

It is because of this acceptance that many handicapped persons are able to get and to hold worthwhile jobs. Employers often find that a handicapped worker, because of his disability, will work harder and more persistently than will a person who is not handicapped. Many disabled persons hold responsible office positions, while others work in factories or own private businesses. These persons can become self-supporting active citizens. There is proof of this fact in our community alone.

Mr. John Raft lost his hands during the war. Many would feel that they could not exist without their hands, but with the use of hooks, Mr. Raft leads a normal life as an insurance salesman. Many people place the well-being of their loved ones in his "hands."

Jim Kaye, a victim of multiple sclerosis, is one of the town's most prominent attorneys. Although he must always remain in a wheelchair, he defends many of the townpeople who are involved in lawsuits.

Miss Diane Baker, a young girl of 23, was stricken with polio in her early childhood. Although she has undergone surgery many times, she is still unable to walk alone. But this disability has not interfered with her life. After having received a college degree, she now interviews people who are looking for employment. Her disposition is a pleasant and cheerful one, even though she has spent most of her life in a wheelchair.

As one can see, the lives of handicapped people can be happy, normal ones. It is with our help, not our sympathy, that they may go into the field of their choice. But these people may also help us. By their cheerfulness, we see how grateful we should be, and that we should strive to make the best of our abilities. Most people are blessed with some particular talent, but the handicapped usually develops this talent to its maximum. They are motivated by a strong desire to compensate for their disability; therefore they work hard to reach their goal.

Wilma Rudolph was told that she would never walk again, but became a triple Gold Medal winner in the Olympics. Glenn Cunningham whose legs were severly burned in an accident, became the champion runner in men's track. These people displayed outstanding achievement in a field that was presumed impossible for them. Jim Kaye, the attorney, is an inspiration to all his colleagues. Although he must be aided in every movement he makes, he is determined to become a successful lawyer and he has achieved that goal. Because of their desire to do that which is deemed impossible for them, the handicapped reach their goals, no matter how unattainable these goals may appear to be. This motivation, if present in those who are not handicapped, could help them to pursue new goals and reach new heights.

Hilo Woman's Club in Hawaii Began Beautification Program in 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the beautification program now made popular by the First Lady of our Land, America is indeed fortunate in that it abounds with "women's clubs." These women's clubs, with their feminine, almost missionary zeal to beautify and improve their communities, have become familiar and respected institutions on the American scene.

The city of Hilo, in the State of Hawaii, has been blessed with an especially active women's club. The Hilo Woman's Club, under the leadership of Mrs. Anastacio Luis, president, recently observed its 45th anniversary. The organization has been an integral part of Hilo's growth and beautification. Among the club's many civic achievements is its continuing beautification program which was begun in the year 1922.

A grateful community headed by County Chairman Shunichi Kimura recently paid tribute to the club by designating Wednesday, January 12, 1966, as Hilo Woman's Club Day. As one who represents the city of Hilo here in the Congress, I join the citizens of that city in commending the women of the Hilo Woman's Club. And I submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Hawaii Tribune-Herald of January 12, 1966, which summarizes the club's 45 years of community service:

HILO WOMAN'S CLUB

For 45 years Hilo has been fortunate to have had a woman's club.

The Hilo Woman's Club celebrates its 45th anniversary today with a record of accomplishments that has made Hilo a better place in which to live.

It is a record that the club can justly be proud of—and the community grateful for.

Some of the accomplishments did not come easily. The club has had to fight for them, sometimes with community support and sometimes by itself. Once the club decided on a course that it thought was right, there was no turning aside, as some politicians and business firms have found out the hard way.

Over the years the club has been criticized for some of the things it did. But time has proved the club right in varied ways.

Community beautification has been a major project. With the great emphasis on beautification throughout the Nation today, it is interesting to recall that the Hilo Woman's Club started its beautification program back in 1922.

Much of Hilo and its surrounding areas has been enhanced by the cleanup, planting and beautification programs of the club. Public grounds have been landscaped, trees and shrubs planted along roadsides and in parks and other public areas. Billboards have been banned and unsightly signs removed.

The club has a long list of achievements in the field of health, education and youth work. It helped, among other things, to establish a playground system, home for girls, dog pound, hospital recreation, a branch of the tuberculosis association, a baby clinic, and scholarships. It has sponsored concerts, works of art and symphonies.

Congratulations are in order today from a community grateful for the many contributions of the Hilo Woman's Club.

Why Not a Bigger Welcome to Foreign Visitors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, a most welcome editorial recently appeared in the Boulder Daily Camera, Boulder, Colo.—a newspaper in my district that serves one of the most active and intelligent communities in the Nation—the community that is the home of the University of Colorado—entitled "Why Not a Bigger Welcome to Foreign Visitors?"

The editorial emphasizes the need to press for a Foreign Visitors Committee set up in American communities to help our foreign visitors more easily become acquainted with us and with our ways.

I am pleased to insert the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

WHY NOT A BIGGER WELCOME TO FOREIGN VISITORS?

Last year the foreign travel "gap" found the United States $1.9 billion behind. U.S. tourists and other travelers spent that much more abroad than their foreign counterparts spent in this country.

President Johnson warned early last year that a large increase in the annual tourist exodus to other countries could worsen the already serious balance-of-payments factor for the United States. He urged citizens to see America first, to forgo the impluse to go abroad.

That appeal might have been expected to backfire. Americans, being of independent spirit, don't relish being told how to conduct their private lives. Often, out of sheer defiance of authority, they will even go out of their way to show that they can do as they durn please.

Rather than urge Americans not to travel in foreign countries, wouldn't it be more in keeping with the spirit of healthy competition to urge foreigners to travel more in this country? The wonder of our land outnumber those in almost any other country you might name. Our national parks and forests, our many summer and winter resorts, our excellent ski slopes and fishing streams, our national capital and various preserved historical villages and buildings, our scientific and art museums—these are only a few of hundreds of major attractions that would entertain and enlighten our foreign neighbors.

One big complaint is that Americans have a tendency to treat foreigners with indifference or even mild contempt. The many things we have to show are offset by the human factor. We are not alone in this characteristic, of course, for U.S. tourists abroad may encounter a certain amount of unfriendliness too—depending sometimes on whether the current regime is headed by a DeGaulle or an Elizabeth.

But there is nothing that says we shouldn't assume leadership in the good neighbor attitude. By doing so, we not only would profit from tourist dollars but also would open the gates of understanding and strengthen the ribbons of friendship.

One useful suggestion is that American communities set up foreign visitors committees to make foreign visitors feel at home, help them get acquainted with local families and bring influence to bear on local citizens to act like friends to their global neighbors.

Committees might well be linked to a nationwide coordinating agency.

If we show that we welcome and appreciate foreign visitors, we shall have them.

Speech of Commissioner George H. Hearn, of Federal Maritime Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB H. GILBERT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, with permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the remarks of Commissioner George A. Hearn, of the Federal Maritime Commission, at the dedication of the Indies Terminal in Los Angeles, Calif., on October 14, 1965:

REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER GEORGE H. HEARN, OF THE FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE INDIES TERMINAL IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF., ON OCTOBER 14, 1965

It is a special honor for me to respond to your warm invitation to participate in the dedication ceremony of this beautiful new terminal, and I am delighted to be here in Los Angeles. It is not as a stranger, or as one unfamiliar with your port that I return on this occasion. Last summer I was privileged to inspect your entire port complex, from the vantage points of both shore and water, and I can assure you that all are impressed with your modern port.

The dedication of a marine terminal, like the christening of a vessel, is an auspicious occasion. Throughout history, the christening of a ship has stirred the hearts of men, particularly seafaring men, and has fired the romantic inclinations of poets. A ship launching has always had an enchanting overtone. One may readily be mesmerized by the imagined intrigues of far-off lands, quaint customs, and high adventure. The christening, if you will, of a modern ocean terminal facility, with its large storage sheds, open work space, and satellite administration office, should equally stir and fire the minds, as well as the hearts, of men with respect to the importance of such a facility in the very real, if not romantic, world of international trade. For the entire spectrum of ocean commerce is culminated at a pier, the efforts of the manufacturer, buyer, seller, carrier, forwarder, port solicitor, and financial underwriter meet at one moment when the cargo is placed in the hands of the terminal operator. The imagination of business realists should certainly be stirred by the birth of a new terminal facility such as this.

The dedication of this particular facility is a concrete testament of faith by the people of this great port. It is an especial manifestation of your faith in your ability to attract cargo and in your hope and reliance on the increasing effort being made by American exporters to expand their stature in the marketplaces throughout the world. Moreover, it is an expression of self-determination which has been confirmed by the tremendous capital outlay, both private and public, in the wonderful facilities which we dedicate today. I compliment all of you who have invested your capital, applied your expertise and exhibited your resolve in bringing this facility into being. I know that you will not suspend your efforts until this magnificent adjunct to your port reaches its optimum efficiency as a thriving nexus between shipper and ship, ship and consignee. I am sure you all are aware of the tremendous efforts made by your able port commission and its staff, abetted and encouraged by the meaningful and farsighted administration of this great city in building this facility. We would be remiss, indeed, if the administration's noble perseverance in port development were not publicly saluted here today.

America, as the entire world knows, has long been a veritable cornucopia producing quality manufactured goods, recovering natural resources, harvesting agricultural produce, and supplying them to the world. As we all know engaging in worldwide commerce is extremely lucrative, it is a form of national wealth and a necessary source of foreign exchange. This has resulted in exceedingly keen competition in the free marketplaces of the world. And while our own products are in demand throughout the free world, because of their excellence, we are finding it increasingly difficult to lay down our goods in foreign ports at competitive prices.

Therefore we must continue to strive to do all we possibly can to insure that point to point transporting rates which include accessorial services, do not impair our ability to sell overseas or to buy here at home. Port and terminal operators in addition to others in the transportation family have the responsibility to insure that cargo-handling charges, which constitute a major element in overall transportation costs, are kept to a minimum. Naturally, due consideration must be given to insure a profit, however a profit which is fair and reasonable. I believe, and obviously the people of vision who have so greatly contributed to this new terminal believe, that it will become an important adjunct to the orderly flow of our import and export commerce. I am confident that the operation of this facility will enhance the validity of the slogan of the Port of Los Angeles that it is "The Cargo Capital of the West."

As all transportation men know, Cargo begets cargo. But the "begetting" is not automatic. Actually the presence of cargo merely creates a favorable environment for more cargo. But that environment must be nurtured and the climate developed so that new and additional cargoes become a reality. None can contest that cargo has not produced cargo here. The record is plain, and thanks to your public-relations-conscious management, it is well known. Moreover, the fact that the Port of Los Angeles maintains farflung offices for the development of cargo, for example in cities of Tokyo and New York, bespeaks strong evidence of your intention to increase your tonnage participation. This activity is one of the important reasons why the Port of Los Angeles has been in first place in total tonnage handled on this coast for over 40 years. The record shows that last year you moved over 4 million tons of general cargo, an all time high, and that early returns for this year point to a new record.

You can be justly proud of your accomplishments at this port. It is heartening to contemplate the impact you have made on the economy of this area, the program for constantly up-dating your harbor facilities and your resolve to generate and move cargo. The relationship and dependency of more than 200,000 jobs in this metropolitan complex to port operations very graphically portrays the economic importance of your undertakings. Your willingness to appropriate huge sums of money for long-range development is a matter of public record.

I understand that you have committed the expenditure of over 60 million dollars on port modernization in a single 5 year period and have on the drawing board projects in the future which will cost upwards of $150 million. At this point, I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge the fact that your multi-million dollar bulk loader will be in full operation in a few weeks.

I understand that it will be capable, during the very first year of operation, of handling 1 million tons of ore. Because of this, and in addition to your already impressive and enviable record, I am happy to note that this is a self-sustaining port. It is refreshing to see a modern port complex grow and thrive in this day and age without the aid of municipal subsidies.

We at the Maritime Commission, as you are aware, have regulatory jurisdiction over common carriers by water, freight forwarders, and terminal operators. These different transportation endeavors are regulated in varying degrees for the purpose of assisting the flow of American commerce on the seas. As you know we have long exercised almost public utility rate authority in our offshore domestic trades. Since 1961 freight forwarders have been required to be licensed by the Commission. Also since 1961, the Commission has required for the first time the filing of inbound and outbound water transportation rates in our foreign trades. While our rate authority over carriers in the foreign trades does not approach our authority in the offshore domestic trades it nevertheless contains meaningful safeguards for the protection of our public interest and the growth of our commerce. Our regulation over ports and terminal operators, on the other hand has traditionally been in the nature of insuring the observance of fair practices.

But with the advent of general rulemaking power given us by the Bonner Act in 1961 the Commission has recently adopted, after deliberate consideration, a rule which requires that all terminal operators who serve common carriers by water file their tariffs with the Commission and make them available to all their customers. This rule, popularly referred to as Docket 875 but now codified as General Order 15, requires that all terminal operators subject to the reach of the Shipping Act, file with the Federal Maritime Commission, and make available to the public, a full schedule of their tariff rates and charges.

I think it appropriate here and now to quote the purpose of the rule: "to enable the Commission to discharge its responsibilities under section 17, Shipping Act, 1916, by keeping informed of practices and rates and charges related thereto, instituted and to be instituted by terminals, and by keeping the public informed of such practices."

For some time, now, some terminal operators have been filing their rate schedules with the Commission and have been making them publicly available, either as the result of ad hoc decisions of the Commission and its predecessors or in response to the Commission's requests for them. However, many terminals neither file their tariffs with the Commission nor make them publicly available. The port of Los Angeles has long filed its rate schedules with the Commission and has made them available for the world to see and to take notice.

Now, I know that there are those who will cite the adoption of this rule as just another example of onerous regulation and needless interference with what are essentially private undertakings. But reasonable men, I think, will agree that the rule will henceforth enable the shipping public to know at all times what the price of an important segment of their total transportation cost will be. Moreover, it will enable those terminal operators who have long and faithfully filed their tariff schedules to know exactly what their competitors are doing. Personally, I am convinced that the thrust of General Order 15 will be signally salutary.

The Commission intends to use its powers over terminal operators not in an oppressive or arbitrary fashion but in a manner which will ennoble our commerce in a way which will redound to the public interest of the United States.

Your burgeoning population, particularly here in the Western United States, offers you a fantastic growth potential for foreign trade. The population in this area as you well know has jumped from about 4 million people in 1940 to over 11½ million last year. Importantly, this rate of growth shows no sign of abating in the foreseeable future. Consequently it is incumbent on you to use your every effort to guarantee that your port growth will keep pace with your area growth. In this regard a realistic search should be made to attract new and different cargoes rather than to divert existing cargo from other port areas.

New concepts of marketing and financing should be exploited and, most certainly, painstaking efforts should be spent to increase port and terminal efficiency. In this vein, I am pleased to note that you have not had a serious labor dispute since 1959, and that the automation that has been implemented here has benefited shipper, carrier, port and longshoreman alike.

The operation of this new facility represents a giant step forward in your avowed schedule of increased and ever-increasing cargo handling efficiency.

Now, we all know of the keen competition for cargo between terminals and between ports. And we all realize, I sincerely hope, the obligation of ports and terminals to attract new and different cargoes rather than to engage in ruinous interport competition. Hand in hand with this obligation, modern, efficient ports are presented with a golden opportunity. It is an unhappy fact of our times that less than 10 percent of American manufacturers attempt to ship their goods to foreign markets. I know of no valid reason why this percentage should remain so anemic. The quality of our manufactures, as we all know, is the envy of the world.

It is your obligation to convince this vast untapped reservoir of American enterprise that it is good business to export; that your port stands ready to assist this vast potential of exporters in their participation in international trade by establishing foreign markets; and that your modern, efficient terminals can safely handle their products with economy and dispatch. In a very large measure and in a very real sense, the potential growth of our foreign commerce depends upon the efforts of enlightened port management.

I understand that the Indies Terminal Co. will operate this facility and that vessels bearing different national flags will call here. We at the Federal Maritime Commission welcome the participation of foreign-flag carriers in our water-borne commerce. The Commission, as we all know, does not recognize any particular flag when it administers or construes the Shipping Act. All carriers are welcome to participate in our trades and as long as common carriers fulfill their obligations under that act they may expect the protection afforded by it. These carriers will find, as they have found in the past, that the Commission is a forum for the airing of their grievances and for the safeguarding of their legitimate interests.

The prime interest of the Commission is, as it must be, the protection of and development of our export and import commerce; in effect, to insure that the foreign commerce of the United States is not prejudice or disadvantaged.

Contrary to the claims of our critics, the Commission does not regulate for regulation's own sake any more than the Shipping Act was passed by Congress as a mere legislative exercise. The Commission's efforts have been addressed to the improvement of our commerce posture with a minimum of interference with the studied and respected judgement of managerial excellence in our transportation media. As a matter of policy, the Commission, I submit, exercises its controls in an effort to increase competition, and only where competition is restricted or controlled by competitors, at their own option, has the Commission attempted to enforce safeguards in the public interest and for the benefit of our commerce.

Let us take a look at some important cases decided by the Commission recently. First, if not foremost, it approved a host of so-called dual-rate contract systems whereby established carriers dedicated to specific trades, could count upon a reservoir of cargo in programming their services. In so approving them, however, the Commission added meaningful safeguards for American shippers and consignees.

It also undertook a broad program of licensing forwarders and laid down ground rules for their conduct. Further, the Commission completed a project whereby literally hundreds of agreements between ports and terminal operators were measured against the standards of the anticompetitive provisions of the Shipping Act. And, finally, the Commission has adopted a rule, as I mentioned before, requiring the filing of tariffs observed by terminal operators subject to the jurisdiction of the Shipping Act. I believe that the weight of the evidence indicates that each of these programs has facilitated the flow of our commerce.

In addition to these activities, the Commission, as I am sure you are aware, is undertaking studies to determine whether ratemaking practices, and the level of conference rates unnecessarily inhibit the flow of our inbound and outbound trades. Protests to the very existence of these studies have been loud and clear. But I would remind those critics that the Commission has not yet passed upon the merits of such studies, and that they should take heart that absent a determination that our trade has suffered as a result of unlawful practices, it is not the custom of the Commission to interfere with them.

On the other hand, I want it made entirely clear, that I for one will not countenance any combination of carriers which serves its own ends to the detriment of our foreign import and export trade. This brings me immediately to the question of steamship conferences. I do recognize their rightful place in our economy. I believe that by and large they serve our foreign commerce well. But the fact remains that their very existence represents a substantial and economic policy of free competition and that in the public interest, steamship conferences, like other combines limiting competition, must be subject to constant surveillance. History confirms, however, that on balance the conference systems has been the handmaid of our commerce. Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that while public awareness and Government scrutiny of conference agreements is on the increase, sophistication and complexity of anticompetitive agreements is likewise increasing.

Free competition is the rule in this country and it has been preeminently successful. Anticompetitive agreements in the shipping industry, when consonant with our public interest and beneficial to our commerce, have been permitted in our commercial society. One reason for this license is that international commerce always involves more than one nation. And traditionally our international trading partners have espoused a business philosophy which has encouraged business combinations. Thus, in an effort to give recognition to our own spirit of free competition and to accomodate the business spirit of our trade partners in international trade, combinations in the shipping industry are lawful when certain safeguards have been observed.

The countenance of conferences demands a fealty to the legitimate commercial endeavors of American exporters and importers. And most certainly, steamship conference agreements which provide for ratemaking or pricefixing, in order to merit the approbation of the Commission, must show a public benefit which overrides the interests of the combination of carriers on the one hand with which individual shippers and consignees must deal on the other hand.

I hope I have left you with the message that the Federal Maritime Commission has a public trust to exercise in the aid of our foreign commerce, that restraints or controls exercised by the Commission are essentially aimed at promoting our waterborne commerce, and that the existence of such controls comes into play, generally, only after the normal flow of commerce has been subjected to private controls or restraints which do not include countervailing safeguards.

In closing, I wish continued success to the great port of Los Angeles, its port commission, the Indies Terminal Co., and the carriers who will use this terminal. I am confident that this facility will form a lasting bridge for the conduct of growing international commerce.

Two-Year Congress Term Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President very dramatically and cleverly wove an endorsement of a 4-year term for Members of the House into his controversial state of the Union message last week. Editorial attention from our leading newspapers on this specific topic has been prominent and interesting. I submit for the Record an editorial from the Chicago Daily News of January 14 which very calmly and effectively discusses the length of House Members' terms.

Two-Year Congress Term Best

President Johnson, as part of his long-range program to bring a little happiness into everybody's life, has turned his attention to Congress itself. He has suggested that U.S. Representatives be elected to 4-year terms in place of the present 2-year system.

A current Gallup poll suggests that as many as 6 in every 10 voters would approve longer terms, chiefly because biennial elections require almost constant campaigning and hence detract from the time a Congressman can spend on his duties.

There are good arguments to be made for both sides, but the arguments in favor of the present system are more persuasive. Consider, for example, the notion that, freed of campaign responsibilities, the Congressman would do a better job. Actually the Congressman who seem to do the best job do so in large measure because they spend considerable time back in their home districts talking to the voters. It may be campaigning, but it is also educational. One reason Congressmen go wrong is that they get caught up in the heady atmosphere of Washington, D.C., and forget their real home is Small Town, U.S.A.

Moreover, the Congress was intended by the Nation's founders to be the people's most direct voice in Federal matters. The lower House was to be the barometer of a changing public opinion—something more permanent than what is produced by the periodic vote-of-confidence test of foreign nations, but flexible enough to test periodically the Nation's viewpoint.

The system has worked quite well through the years. With rare exceptions, the voters have bolstered the "outs" in off-year balloting for Congress—another of the checks and balances which seem to be the magical ingredient in our form of government. Some restraint on an all-powerful Presidency could result if the 4-year terms were filled in off-year elections, but at a cost of the flexibility of the present system.

Congress itself indirectly recognizes the fast pace of today's world by remaining in almost constant session. Much of its effective leadership comes from the stability of experience—the Members from "sure" districts who have built up seniority and, in turn, leadership. But, from a quarter to perhaps a third of the Members are from "swing" districts and the every 2-year test does serve to approve or reject the trends of leadership.

The Democratic Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, Americans believe basically in the right of each American to have a voice in his government.

A citizen is important. His vote counts. This is so basic that we call it our way of life. It is democracy.

If we can truthfully say that we believe these principles are the guiding light for our great Nation, then why should we deny this same principle to one city—Washington, D.C.? Here, too, there are citizens. Here, too, they have the right to say how the city in which they live is to be run.

Along these lines, the Boston Herald makes some telling observations in an editorial entitled, "Home Rule in 1966," which I include in the Record:

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 11, 1966]

Home Rule in 1966

Washington, D.C., is a city of 819,000. It is much like any other large American city except for two things: It is the seat of the Federal Government, and it is not self-governing.

For many years the residents of Washington have been trying to get home rule. There does not seem to be any particular reason why they should not have it. And there are many sound reasons why they should have it instead of having their city run by Members of Congress who do not always have the best interests of Washington in mind.

The real issue in the long controversy has been a rather crude one. It is whether Washington is to remain a southern city in the worst sense of the word, or whether it is to join the urban mainstream of America.

Certain southern legislators want to keep it a southern city in which the Negro is kept in the status of second-class citizen living in second-class housing, sending his children to second-class schools, and realizing second-class opportunities.

Last year home rule bills came closer than ever before. The Senate passed a bill recommended by President Johnson. With the President's vigorous backing another home rule bill got to the floor of the House, but was foiled by complicated parliamentary maneuvering which resulted in the passage of a substitute bill. So now, with the reopening of Congress, the home rule battle will be waged anew.

The bill passed by the Senate and the bill passed by the House are very different. Whether some compromise can be worked out between the two or whether the twain are too far apart to meet remains to be seen.

But if home rule is to be passed this session it will take the influence of the President to do it. It will take the efforts and votes of New England Congressmen, too. It's time Washington should be allowed to join the United States.

Efforts Are Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, little children sometimes ask a teacher or a parent—"Why is there war?"

Men do wage war, but they also strive for peace. In this age of ours, communications are faster than ever before. We have means of getting messages to other peoples. If people want peace, then they must talk about the possibilities of peace.

American motives can and will help in the struggle for peace. We can with all truth say that while we are strong and willing to stand firm against aggression, in our hearts we want peace. We seek no territory or expansion of our great land. We want to return our soldiers home.

As the Denver Post recently noted:

> Whatever the future holds, we can approach it in the knowledge that our peace effort was substantial and genuine.

This editorial entitled, "U.S. Peace Effort Is No Trick," praises the pursuit of peace which this administration has taken, and I include it in the Record:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Jan. 12, 1966]

U.S. Peace Effort Is No Trick

The news that the United States has made a direct "contact" with Hanoi in the course of its peace offensive is encouraging, but not especially significant in itself.

Secretary of State Rusk disclosed 6 weeks ago that there have been a number of contacts with Hanoi and other Communist centers and that the contacts were due to continue.

He added, however—and the statement can hardly be challenged—that "the problem with the other side is not a problem of contacts."

The problem, in part, is what the United States and "the other side" communicate to each other when the contacts are made.

In the most recent contacts with the North Vietnamese and others, the United States has reportedly been attempting to convey the substance of 14 points disclosed in Washington at the end of last year.

The U.S. position, as embodied in these points, can be summarized as follows:

First, the United States is ready to enter formal negotiations or informal discussions, with or without a previous cease-fire, on the problems of southeast Asia or any part of it. The Vietcong could be represented at the sessions, but probably indirectly and not in its own right.

Second, the United States would be willing to proceed at these sessions on the basis of the 1954 Geneva agreements, which provide, among other things, for the reunification of South and North Vietnam on the basis of free elections. Reunification, in the U.S. view, would have to result from the free decision of the peoples involved.

Third, in seeking these negotiations or discussions, the United States wants no military bases in southeast Asia, does not want a continuing U.S. military presence in South Vietnam, agrees that nations in southeast Asia can be neutral or nonalined and is willing to contribute $1 billion to a regional development program in which North Vietnam could take part.

Fourth, the United States is willing to discuss at the peace table the four-point negotiating position of the Communists and to refrain from bombing if there are indications that this will contribute toward a peaceful settlement.

It is difficult to see how the United States could go much further than that, except on the question of seating Vietcong representatives directly at the peace table.

This newspaper has previously indicated its hopes that the issue of the participation of the Vietcong will not be allowed to stand in the way of a peace conference.

Since the Vietcong are still doing the bulk of the fighting against the government of South Vietnam and against us, they belong at the peace table. Our government would do well to make it clear that it will not block their direct participation.

Apart from the question of the Vietcong role, our 14 points are so conspicuously reasonable that they cannot have failed to impress the world leaders to whom President Johnson's emissaries have been explaining them.

Although there is a great gap between stating principles and implementing them in the details of a working agreement, we can hardly be expected to close that gap until we have a chance to sit down and try at the peace table. Unless we get the chance, no one can justly say that our peace offensive is a trick.

We do not know what measures this Nation will be obliged to take in the weeks that lie ahead. Whatever the future holds, we can approach it in the knowledge that our peace effort was substantial and genuine.

We have made the "contacts" that have to be made, both with Hanoi and with others. During those contacts, we have offered reasonable terms for peace talks and assurances of a reasonable negotiating position.

We ought to go on pressing this peace campaign, while we continue the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam at the same time. Our effort deserves to win us the understanding and support of most of the nations of the world. Perhaps, if we give it enough time and get enough help from other nations, it may even bear fruit in Hanoi.

Peace Corps Gains Able Leadership in Appointment of Jack Vaughn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alliance for Progress and Latin America lost the full-time services of one of its most able and stanch supporters last Monday when President Johnson announced the appointment of the Honorable Jack Hood Vaughn as the new Director of the Peace Corps. I am confident that his ability and total effort which he has always demonstrated will keep the Peace Corps at the same high level and fine caliber which it has enjoyed since its inception.

Director-designate Vaughn appeared probably in his last official capacity in the Congress a week ago today when he appeared in executive session before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. He explained in his modest and able manner the reasons why the Alliance for Progress is making great advances, and, contrary to many pessimistic viewpoints that we have heard predicted, 1966 is going to be the greatest year in history in terms of growth and improvement in Latin America. This enthusiasm which he displays is bound to be instilled in those with whom he will work in the Peace Corps.

Mr. Vaughn, in the 45 years of his life, has had a varied and superlative career. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps, was a university instructor, a professional boxer, served in the early days of the foreign-aid program, and was previously Assistant Director of the Peace Corps for Latin America before the President called him to be his right-hand man for the Alliance for Progress.

I am told that his short address before the U.S. delegation to the United Nations in December at the time when Ambassador Goldberg was inviting all the regional Assistant Secretaries to address that group, was one of the most sincere and honest evaluations of any situation that the delegation had heard.

I am sure my colleagues join me in wishing the new Director, Jack Vaughn, great success in his new assignment.

A Newspaperman's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Bob Considine has periodically offered a newspaperman's prayer as the code by which he tries to live as a journalist and as a man.

The innate good sense and compassion for his fellow man contained in this prayer can stand us all in good stead.

The article appeared in the January 4, 1966, edition of the New York Journal American and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

A Newspaperman's Prayer

(By Bob Considine)

This is as good a time as any, at the start of a new year, to remind myself of something I pledged a long time ago—and try to live up to as best I can. I called it, in that happy long ago, a Newspaperman's Prayer.

Fasten seat belts, please, and no smoking:

Dear God, may I be fair. Circumstances and dumb luck have placed in my thumby paws a degree of authority which I may not fully comprehend. Let me not profane it.

Give me the drive that will make me check and countercheck the facts. Guide me when, lost for want of a rudder or a lead, I stumble through the jungle of speculation. Grant me, as the poet sang:

The courage to change
  The things I can change;
The serenity to accept
  Those I cannot change, and
The wisdom to know the difference.

The 26 sharp-edged tools we call our alphabet can do what other tools do; build or destroy. Let me build. But let me know clearly, also what should be destroyed, what darkness, what bigotry, what evil, what curse, what ignorance.

Never let me slip into writing down in fatuous fear that readers will not understand. Let me write from the shoulder, and always with the assumption that those who read know more than I.

Such news as I find or comes my way, let me tell it quickly and accurately and simply, with an eye to my responsibilities. For news is precious. Few could live without it. When it is stopped or thwarted or twisted, something goes out of the hearts of men it might have nourished. Confront a starving man with his choice of a succulent meal or the promise to reveal instantly news of great importance, and he will first take the news. "Think" pieces, as we say in the trade to identify articles and columns contrived out of airy nothingness, or from a prone position, can never replace the meat and potatoes of news.

Let me champion just causes, avoid expediency, never lose the stimulation engendered by printer's ink. Remind me to be kind to copyboys, for I'll meet them on the way back down—when they are editors. Protect the innocent from me when, with headlines pressing, my aim grows fuzzy.

Make me use my legs and eyes, the better to track down and see the truth. Deafen me to the Lorelei song of ruthless hearsay, rumor, and the gossip of town loafers. If word that could cause harm comes to me, even from sources far above reproach, let me have the dexterity and decency to pick up a phone and ask the subject about it.

When the customers write in to accuse me of being a bum, let me consider carefully the possibility or probability that I am * * * and try to do better. Let me work harder, try harder, and recall with proper humility that history produced some notably abler reporters, including four journeymen named Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

Let my stomach rebel at plucking meat from publicity handouts and let me not be miffed when someone says, "You had a pretty good piece last week, but I can't remember what it was."

As long as our men fight, sweat, and die in actual or cold war, sacrifices which at times should make our food stick in our throats and our luxuries a torment, let me never cheaply use the words "courage" or "guts" to describe the means by which a pitcher wins a ball game, a gridman bucks a line, a golfer sinks a putt, or a fellow makes a speech.

And above all, let me recall repeatedly what the great teachers of the past * * * Moses and Socrates and Christ * * * would have done if by some alchemy they had been given the breathtaking break of swift and farflung communications.

Travel Within the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, as the Member from Virginia's First Congressional District which has within its boundaries a number of our Nation's impelling tourist attractions, I am understandably very deeply interested in the "Visit U.S.A." and "Discover America" programs. Attraction of travelers is one of the Virginia Commonwealth's major economic activities. Virginians are, therefore, always interested in efforts to increase travel to and within the United States.

For this reason, I was pleased recently to have the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Charles F. Murphy as a guest in my district recently. Mr. Murphy delivered an address before the Air Traffic Conference of the Air Transport Association at Williamsburg, Va. I believe his talk will be of great interest to my colleagues because of widespread congressional interest in encouraging our people to travel within the United States.

I believe my colleagues will find Mr. Murphy's talk worthy of their attention, and I would like to insert it in the Appendix of the Record:

Remarks of Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the Air Traffic Conference of the Air Transport Association, Williamsburg, Va.

I want to talk to you today about a subject in which we have a very keen mutual interest: encouraging more people to do more traveling by air to the United States and within the United States. I want to urge you to increase and strengthen the very considerable efforts you are already making for this purpose, and to pledge my cooperation in your efforts.

This subject is important to us for a number of reasons, reasons that extend beyond the well-being of the air transportation industry itself. The Congress has indicated clearly in the Federal Aviation Act that the air transportation industry should be developed to serve national purposes, to bring benefits to our Nation as a whole and to all its people. I would think it clear that one measure of how well the industry is serving these national purposes is the extent to which people patronize the industry.

If you look upon your recent phenomenal traffic growth as of importance only because of its beneficial effects upon airlines, I suggest that you are taking too narrow a view of the world, and are not doing justice to yourself.

You are entitled to great credit for the benefits you are bringing to our whole economy and our whole society.

It is frequently said these days that the airlines came of age in 1965. They have had a fantastic development over the past 20 years. This didn't just happen. You have worked hard to provide the best possible product. You have succeeded in making air travel invaluable to an estimated 20 million people who will fly in 1965, people who will make more than 90 million separate trips to domestic and foreign destinations. You can be justly proud of these accomplishments but you cannot relax in your endeavors.

The fact that you are doing well and that the future looks bright does not make the task easy from here on out, either for you or for the Board. It does make it more interesting and in a sense more challenging. You now have good strong tools to work with and can set your sights upon new horizons. This is a much more satisfying task than a struggle just to keep your heads above water.

Among these new horizons, high priority should be given to a vast increase of pleasure travel by air to and within the United States. This is made urgent by the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. When the air transportation industry is looked at as a whole, including sales of aircraft by U.S. manufacturers to foreign air carriers, the net adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments is much smaller than when you look only at the expenditures of travelers to and from the United States. Nevertheless, the margin of expenditures by Americans going abroad above expenditures by foreign travelers coming to the United States is so large as to present a very serious problem. It clearly behooves our air carriers in their own interest to do all they appropriately can to narrow this so-called travel gap in order to avoid the need for more drastic remedies.

The carriers do recognize this problem and are doing something about it. "Visit U.S.A." fares have been made available to foreign nationals. Transatlantic excursion fares have been made available, and the recent IATA Conference in Bermuda has proposed further reductions in these excursion fares as well as the establishment of tour basing fares. It is too early to say with certainty whether these proposed tariff changes will become effective; but if they do, we must make every effort to see that they increase travel to the United States even more than they increased travel from the United States.

One thing that is clearly called for is more destination advertising by U.S.-flag carriers in foreign media to promote travel to the United States. This kind of advertising is growing, I'm glad to say. I commend you for what you are doing already and for the larger efforts you are already planning. I urge you to accentuate your promotional campaigns in other countries as much as you can.

Now I wish to turn to the promotion of pleasure travel by air by our own people within our own country. It seems to me that here perhaps we have at the same time one of our greatest potential markets, one of the biggest gaps in our promotional activities to date, and one of our best opportunities to improve the adverse balance of payments.

"Discover America" is a program close to the heart of this administration, as you know. Quite apart from the urgency due to the deficit in the balance of payments, this program can contribute richly to the social and economic opportunity of our citizens. We have much yet to do to bring this country to the doorstep of its own residents. Another aim of the administration is to get people out of their cars and off the crowded highways. I am sure you share this goal—as long as it means getting them off the ground as well. No one holds out serious hope that all those who drive are potential vacationers by air. However, it is worth remembering that if you can attract only 1 percent of these drivers, it will mean an increase of 15 percent over your present market.

At this point, it seems to me that the public and private interest fuse. In this era of unprecedented prosperity, the public is entitled to new travel experiences, experiences which are possible only with the savings in time and cost which the jets offer. The other side of the same coin is that you need their business.

We would all be acting like the proverbial ostrich if we let your current profit position—gratifying indeed as it is, obscure the fact that 45 percent of your capacity is flying empty. This amounts to 37 billion seat miles a year, equal to the total capacity which you offered just a short 8 years ago in 1957. We are fortunate indeed that American technology has produced the amazingly efficient jet. Otherwise, we could well be in deep trouble at the moment. For I know no other industry which could approach a profitable state operating at little more than half of its capacity. But even in your industry, it would be folly from the standpoint of your private interests, the national economy, and the public welfare to accept such a waste of potential as just one more regrettable fact of life.

To accentuate the problem, you are going to have a tremendous increase in capacity during the immediate years hence. Firm orders are on the books for some 700 aircraft, most of which will enter domestic service. I for one welcome the improvement in service, which will make jets the order of the day across the country, at many of our smaller as well as large communities. However, there is no denying the fact that the prospective capacity is staggering. We will need a sustained and substantial increase in traffic just to hold onto the present relatively low-load factor level.

The bright side of this picture is the marvelous efficiency of jet aircraft. They have produced the lowest seat mile cost in airline history. Coupled with this is the rather incredible leverage which you have above the break-even point. As of June 30, 1965, the break-even load factor for the domestic trunkline carriers stood at about 48 percent. Above this point, every seat flying unsold means a revenue loss; every seat sold means that gross profits on the order of 80 to 85 percent can be tapped from the additional revenue. This is an enviable range of opportunity to have tucked under your arm.

To put this basic fact another way, in 1963 you had a net income (after taxes) of only $12 million. Traffic for the year ended June 1965, was up 23 percent over 1963, unit expenses were down 10 percent. These trends are the kind we like to see. But the real leverage shows when it comes to net income—up more than 1,200 percent from 1963 to an alltime high of $160 million. I hardly need to remind you that this leverage can cut both ways. Just as passengers above the break-even load factor brings profits up sharply, empty seats below the break-even load factor can mean large losses. Thus, there is every reason for you to build new traffic to match your new capacity.

I have no doubt that our buoyant economy can sustain the capacity explosion of the next few years. Air travel has long since become indispensable to the businessman. It is now inextricably woven into the fabric of our economy. The savings in time which it makes possible have improved efficiency and allowed us to reduce the cost of goods and services. These benefits will continue and magnify, probably for some time to come at an even greater rate than the pace of the economy as a whole. The business traveler is "time" poor. You have served him well with an excellent product which has no peer in terms of speed, safety, and reliability. He has responded accordingly and this market is highly dependable.

But I am convinced that in nonbusiness markets the airlines are in a position to do more, that they should do more, and that they will make even greater profits in the process. A recently published survey by the Port of New York Authority reports business travel at that major city up 84 percent from 1956 to 1963. Growth in pleasure travel, on the other hand, lagged at half the pace. These people are "money" poor. They are interested in speed, but for a different purpose and only at a price. If the price is beyond their means, or out of line with other consumer products, they will again content themselves with a holiday at the nearby beach or mountain resort. These are the people that you must reach.

Creating attractive and salable products for this market presents a real challenge to your merchandising talents. The seats on your airplanes may all look the same, but they mean very different things to the personal traveler and the businessman. To both they represent a means of getting to a chosen destination. However, for the business traveler the cost is defrayed at least in part by the increased efficiency of his company. For the personal traveler, the cost represents a choice among various objects of nonessential spending. Economists call this the discretionary dollar. Right now, I'd be willing to bet that a lot of people are suffering a real conflict of interest between a 2-week holiday or a 52-week color TV set. The competition is keen, and it can only become more so as population, income, and leisure time increase.

I am particularly pleased to see that you are working toward a joint marketing study with the travel agents and others engaged in the business of tourism. I hope and trust that you will get this project off the ground promptly. It is an important step which should not be allowed to bog down over parochial issues, to die the lingering and painful death which is too often the fate of such pilot projects.

Despite the long-range value which we can expect from this study, I do not think we should wait for its conclusion before moving ahead. Certainly, it should help to clarify the most effective path to follow. But the general direction of that path is known today. And there is an old saying that the perfect is the enemy of the good.

Travel agents and tour organizers can offer a wealth of assistance in reaching out to the personal traveler. They have been in touch with him for years. They know how he looks at things, what he wants here, what he will settle for there, in the interest of time and budget. They have also worked closely over the years with hotels, restaurants, sightseeing organizations, and car rental agencies, all of whom stand to gain immeasurably. It makes good sense to marshall their expertise in opening doors to the domestic travel scene, offering them tools to work with and enlisting their imagination in developing attractive new tourist packages.

As a practical matter, I think that we can expect only limited success in getting their most enthusiastic support for travel within the United States as long as there continues to be a disparity in the incentives for selling domestic and international transportation. At the moment, agents are more interested in selling the latter. Quite understandably. They get a higher commission on these sales. What is more, it is generally cheaper and easier to get acquainted with what they are selling. And it is pretty hard to sell something you have never seen.

I would put a solution to this problem down as a high-priority task for the Board and yourselves. We are working on it, and we want to work with you. It seems to me that the answer lies somewhere between the very liberal system which has been followed internationally and the very stringent one which we have held you to domestically. The agent has a valid business interest in acquainting himself with the product he sells. This should be accommodated. But the very great discount which he has handed to him internationally, coupled with virtually wide open rules on the number of permissible trips, go far beyond this need. It can only lead to the abuse which we all know exists entry into the field of what has been called the dilettante agent, intent basically upon gaining access to low-cost travel for himself. This profits no one; neither the public, the airlines, nor the legitimate hard-working agent.

On the other hand, I think we need a more satisfactory system domestically, a system which promotes more realistically the agent's business needs and potential productiveness, a system that will at the same time protect against proliferation and abuse.

It may well be that the solution is to be found in a conference administered program, both domestically and internationally. This would foster a professional—if you will, nonalined—application of ground rules agreed upon by all, and avoid the intervention of competitive pressures between carrier and carrier, agent and agent. We would welcome your thoughts, suggestions, and specific proposals.

I understand that the question of costing out the sale of a ticket may be encompassed within your joint study. I hope that this will be the case. Nevertheless, this should not be used as an excuse to avoid interim measures which will place the level of commissions more closely in parity. One such step would be to raise the commission rate on family plan sales to the 7 percent which generally prevails internationally. I am told that you all concur on this, despite the fact that it fell by the wayside when your overall proposal to revamp the structure was withdrawn. Another step which occurs to me would be a higher commission rate on the sale of packaged tours which will give due recognition to the promotional role of the tour developer.

The task of developing tourism will inevitably call for price reductions—selective but substantial. For there is another very real difference between personal and business travel which it is well to keep in mind, the net cost of the seat to each. This is close to the heart of airline economics. The businessman's transportation is paid for with pretax dollars, personal travel with after-tax dollars. Oversimplifying the arithmetic a bit, a $100 fare is actually only about $50 to the businessman. This creates a distinctly different set of economic considerations, and indeed an anomaly. An airplane seat which has become something of a necessity to the businessman costs him half what it costs a vacation traveler, to whom it is a luxury. It is a small wonder that the pleasure traveler has his ear close to the ground when it comes to price.

With a lot of empty seats disappearing into thin air every hour of the day, it is just plain good sense for you to find ways to fill them. There is no doubt in my mind that you can fill many of them. This country harbors some of the most magnificent recreational areas in the world. You do not have to go to Switzerland to ski or enjoy the vistas of a great mountain range. Aspen, Colo., and the Grand Teton range are quite as inspiring. The sun in Florida, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico is quite as much a soothing tonic as in the Mediterranean. New York is probably unique in the world; as are the great desert stretches of Arizona and New Mexico. San Francisco is a match for any in sophistication, and the French Quarter of New Orleans is as intriguing as any quaint little village in Europe.

Moreover, the fact is that this is a very big country. It simply cannot be explored by car or rail in the limited vacation time which most of us have at our disposal. Only the airlines can fill this bill.

I was very interested in a recent article in Aviation Week which discusses your experience with the liberalized family fares. These fares seem to be proving the wisdom of selective price concessions targeted at particular markets. Some of you are quoted as having realized a doubling of family plan revenues. More significant to me and I am sure to you is the increase in the number of full-fare paying passengers coupled with a noticeable increase in the average size of the family unit. This means a solid return to you, and it certainly bespeaks success in hitting the mark with that person whom we call the potential traveler.

If you are a traveler from abroad, you can now fly anywhere on the systems of most local service carriers and a number of trunklines at a flat charge. This is a wonderful opportunity, and would be even more wonderful, of course, if it could be made available by the entire domestic industry on a joint across-the-board basis. I wonder if something comparable could be available to our own citizens. Any one of us in this room can travel all the way around this whole country on one $99 ticket, taking 99 days to do it, as long as we go by bus. Unfortunately, not many of us have that kind of time.

Have you thought of trying to devise an industrywide package along these lines? Perhaps it could be on a space-available basis to protect your regular fare, or applicable only on off-peak flights which operate primarily for mail or equipment rotation purposes and hence at very low passenger load factors. Perhaps it could be developed as an all-expense tour proposition. And perhaps this approach would not be feasible at all. It may well be that the most effective channel to new traffic is a series of individually designed excursion fares. These are some of the questions which need thought. We look to you for some answers. The point which we must not lose sight of is that the traffic we are talking about is "top off" in terms of profits.

The concept of the all-expense tour seems to me to hold out exceptional promise as a means of bringing tourism within reach of the average income. It pools the advantage of wholesale buying for the producers, with obvious benefit to the consumer. The promise can be fulfilled, however, only if the airlines will be generous in offering tour-basing fares which will really stimulate the tour organizer's interest and activity. You are familiar, I am sure, with the rather dramatic popular clamor for such travel in Europe. Blue and white collar workers fly in droves to a holiday in the Mediterranean sun. It is now generally accepted that these are brandnew customers to airline service. We have in this country the most highly developed and most efficient air transport system in the world. I find it inconceivable that we cannot bring the same sort of advantage to our people.

In summary, let me repeat my urging that you make every effort to increase air travel to and within the United States.

This is important in order to: Achieve a fuller realization of the benefits of air travel for individuals in their personal lives; stimulate general economic activity through expenditures related to air travel; improve the U.S. balance-of-payments position; and broaden and strengthen the economic base of the air transportation industry.

As to how this laudable objective with respect to U.S. travel is to be achieved, I certainly do not have all the answers, but suggest that the means which should be given your most urgent consideration include the following: Increased destination advertising with respect to places in the United States, addressed to potential travelers both within the United States and abroad; better arrangements to take full advantage of the traffic-generating abilities of travel agents and tour operators; wider use of all-expense tours—available to travelers originating in the United States or abroad; and extension of special "Visit U.S.A." fares of some kind of travelers originating within the United States.

In this area I am discussing with you today, the stakes are high in terms both of your profits and the contribution which air transportation can make to an improved standard of living in this country. It behooves us all to work together in pursuit of this future. I assure you that the Board will bend every effort to help work out mutually satisfactory solutions to whatever problems we may run into along the way. We might also prod, if prodding seems to be indicated. For I believe that the Board feels a certain sense of urgency about this.

A week or so ago I spoke to the ATA's Airline Finance and Accounting Conference. I took that opportunity to discuss the Board's approach to profits, earnings, and fares. I sincerely hope that I dispelled any uncertainties and fears which there may have been about the Board's dedication to good profits. So that there can be no lingering doubt, let me say again that we like to see you strong and prosperous as you are today. We like to see your profits healthy and climbing. We seek to secure those profits. We seek also a new dimension of opportunity for the public. These two objectives go hand in hand.

Control of Strategic Waterways: Aden Crisis Poses Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as stressed by me on previous occasions when discussing Panama Canal problems, a prime objective of the world revolutionary movement known as the international Communist conspiracy has long been to secure effective control over vital sea transportation routes:

In a statement to the House on September 9, 1965, entitled "Soviet Strategy on the High Seas: Control of Narrow Waters," I listed the Strait of Bab el Mandeb at the southern end of the Red Sea as one of the key points on the round-the-world maritime route because of its relation to the Suez Canal and quoted an illuminating article by Gen. James D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, distinguished military and naval analyst of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. In that article, he dealt comprehensively with the subject.

A growing crisis in Aden, a British protectorate in southern Arabia next to Yemen, emphasizes the strategic location of this country in the control of the southern approach to the Suez Canal. In a recent news story General Hittle clearly shows what is at stake in the current drive for "liberation" of Aden.

In order that all agencies of our Government and the Nation at large may have the benefit of General Hittle's latest appraisal, I include the indicated article as part of my remarks:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Union, Dec. 4, 1965]

Aden Crisis Poses Threat to Sea Lanes

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

Washington.—The fast heating crisis in Aden, England's protectorate at the southern end of the Arabian Peninsula, is no homegrown variety of trouble. And there is far more involved than the issue of so-called independence.

Longtime observers of Mideast affairs say that the native demand for independence is only a subterfuge. The real objective is to kick the British out of their Aden base. If that can be accomplished, it means the loss of another strategic control point to the free world.

Aden's importance is obvious.

Once again, it is a matter of geography, the common denominator of strategy. British Empire builders long ago realized Aden's strategic importance when they hoisted the Union Jack there in 1839 and quickly made Aden a key British base in the Indian Ocean area.

LIFELINE CHANGES

Commanding the southern—Indian Ocean—entrance to the Red Sea which, in turn is the northern approach to Suez, Aden's importance vastly increased when the canal opened in 1869. Suez meant the end of the long haul around Africa from Europe to India and the Far East. The lifeline of the Empire now ran from Europe through the Mediterranean to Suez, down the long Red Sea corridor, and then into the Indian Ocean at Aden.

Aden was an essential part of the power complex that permitted Britain, well before the end of the 18th century, to establish an effective control on the Indian Ocean basin.

Britain held Singapore, controlling the Malacca Straits, the eastern entrance to the Indian Ocean. The Aden base commanded the western entrance.

MANY CHANGES NOTED

Things began to change, however, with the end of World War II. There basic factors hastened that change and the ensuing turmoil: First, the loss of India to the Crown; second, the virtual disappearance of the British Navy from the Indian Ocean; third, the Soviet Union's drive for control of the narrow water corridors.

Moscow knew that Red control of the sea gates would mean the strategic fragmentation of the free world. Results of this aspect of Communist pressure are evident in Soviet Caribbean policy now focused on Panama, and in the fast-worsening Singapore situation.

But Kremlin planners didn't forget Aden. The terror, assassination, subversion and rebellion in Aden are the cumulative result of the Soviet penetration of Egypt which gathered momentum in the mid-1950's.

INVASION FOUNDATION

This laid the strategic and political foundation for Egyptian President Gamal Abddel Nasser's invasion of Yemen which carried the spearhead of aggression southward to the ill-defined Yemen-Aden border.

Now violence has reached the point in Aden where Britain recently suspended constitutional rights.

It is increasingly evident that Russia is driving to push England out of both Singapore and Aden so it can replace England as the keeper of the eastern and western sea gates of the Indian Ocean.

"The 'Voice' Speaks: All Must Pay More for the Bankers' Product"—An Analysis of the Federal Reserve Board's Interest Rate Hike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our former colleague in the House, Jerry Voorhis, has distinguished himself as a champion of the consumer for many years. Jerry Voorhis was an outstanding spokesman and fighter for the consumer when he served as a Congressman from California, and he has continued his invaluable service to the "little man" of the country as executive secretary of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

He has been a consistent opponent of the consumer's No. 1 enemy—high interest rates. Following the Federal Reserve Board's decision to raise interest rates on December 3, Jerry Voorhis analyzed in dramatic and eloquent terms what this action means to the consumer and to the ecnomy as a whole.

The analysis appeared in "The People's Business," a feature service distributed by the Cooperative News Service. I insert a copy of this excellent document in the Record:

The "Voice" Speaks: All Must Pay More for the Bankers' Product—I

(By Jerry Voorhis)

Once more the voice has been heard in the land.

It is the voice of the greatest special privilege ever granted by any nation to any group of private citizens in all history.

It is a voice to which the wise men of the country, almost all the newspapers and commentators, the Secretary of the Treasury, and even the President of the United States listen and bow their heads and genuflect.

The voice says:

"This country is too prosperous."

"There is too much money in circulation."

"Unemployment has been reduced and some industries are producing at or near capacity."

"The value of money has been going slowly down and the money value of goods and services has been going slowly up."

"These things must not be." So sounds the voice, the voice of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

From one point of view, these things which have been happening are bad. From every other point of view they are good.

They are bad from the point of view of the banks, which have—wrongly—been given the privilege of creating the money of this supposedly "sovereign" nation.

They are good from the point of view of the workers who were unemployed but who now have jobs again. They are good from the point of view of farmers, manufacturers, merchants, everybody that produces or sells goods.

But as has happened so often when the single interest of the private creators of money clashes with the interest of all the rest of the people in the country, the interest of the bankers has prevailed.

It has prevailed not through any act of Congress or the President or the Secretary of Treasury or anybody else who is responsible to the people of this country.

The bankers have prevailed because their own private "government," the Federal Reserve Board, which is accountable to no one but itself and the private banks which own the Federal Reserve Banks, has so decreed. (The only sense in which the Federal Reserve Board can be said to be accountable to any public body is that Congress could, of course, amend or repeal the law that created the Federal Reserve System.)

Even the Federal Reserve Board voted only 4 to 3 for the increase in interest rates.

Four-sevenths of a group of private bankers responsible to nobody but private bankers for their actions has decided that:

1. Interest rates throughout the country shall be about 10 percent higher than they are now. (They increased the Federal Reserve's discount rate from 4 to 4½ percent—a 11 percent increase.)

2. Every home shall cost about 10 percent more than it does now.

3. Every farmer must repay his debts in money that is about 10 percent harder to get and worth 10 percent more than when he borrowed it.

4. The cost of everything we buy or use shall go up about 10 percent because the cost of money or credit is the one element that enters into the cost of almost everything we buy or use in all our economic life.

5. The taxpayers of the Nation shall be forced to pay at least $1 billion more in interest on the national debt than they do now.

6. And every piece of household furniture, every washing machine, every automobile, every other thing bought on credit shall cost the family that buys it—rich or poor—some 10 percent more than it does now. And this will happen not because any of these goods are actually worth a single penny more than they were before, but solely because four private bankers say it must—four out of seven on a Federal Reserve Board which can control the whole Nation's economic fate.

Reserve Board's Action Makes Moneylending More Profitable—II

(By Jerry Voorhis)

William McChesney Martin, Jr., who has just told the President of the United States to go sit in a corner, has an excuse. Yes. The four out of seven members of Mr. Martin's Federal Reserve Board have their standard excuse for the blow they have struck at the Nation's economy.

It is the same excuse that the Federal Reserve Board used in May of 1920 when it deliberately caused a deflation of the currency so severe that America's agriculture was plunged into a depression from which it did not recover until the middle of World War II.

It is the same excuse that was used in 1938 when most of the gains in economic activity which had been accomplished during the preceding 5 years of the Roosevelt administration were wiped out in a couple of months.

It is the excuse that "We must curb inflation."

Everybody is supposed to remember the disastrous inflation that took place in Germany after World War I. And the inflation recently suffered in Brazil. Then everybody is supposed to become frightened and to say, "Oh, yes. By all means we must curb inflation."

But still it seems a bit odd, if we really wish to "curb inflation," to adopt measures that will absolutely assure the sharp inflation of every price and cost in the entire economy of the Nation.

This hardly seems a sensible way to prevent inflation of prices or costs.

But it does make money more valuable in terms of all real wealth. And it will make all real wealth less valuable in terms of money.

Which is the real reason why it is done.

But it is a reason involving so many undesirable implications that hardly anyone—least of all the Federal Reserve Board—ever talks about it.

Another reason is being alleged. It is being suggested that the raising of interest rates will discourage American investors from investing their money abroad and cause them to invest at home, thus correcting the balance of payments. But the result, the immediate result of the action, has been to cause a slump in the stock market and in the value of almost all American securities. This is a strange way indeed to encourage investment in these sound American securities.

No. The reason for this Federal Reserve Board action is rather simple. It is taken to increase the value of money and reduce the value of everything else in our economy.

Who would want to do such a thing?

The people who deal in money, who have money to sell at interest, who indeed have the privilege of creating new money and drawing upon the credit of the entire Nation and all its people to give value to that newly created money.

If you are in the business of creating and lending money, as the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks are, then quite obviously if you can get a 4-to-3 decision to increase your income by 10 percent, all of a sudden, it's a very good thing to get done for you.

But from the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole, one or two sobering thoughts occur.

One is that every single depression or recession which we have ever suffered has been preceded by a period of shortage in the money supply. And many people believe that, far from having increased too rapidly, our money supply in very recent years has not been increasing fast enough and that this is the reason for our persistent unemployment, for the failure of many industries to operate at anywhere near their capacity, and for the flow of investment funds out of the country.

Another thought is that a number of other countries, notably Japan and Western Europe, have experienced much more rapid growth rates since the close of World War II than has the United States. And in every one of those countries the key to that rapid growth has been monetary policies which have assured a growth in the money supply which was always a little ahead of the growth of industry and commerce. In other words, these countries have brought about, quite deliberately, a controlled expansion of their money.

Some people—four-sevenths of the Federal Reserve Board among them, no doubt—might call this an inflation. But certainly it has not been a harmful inflation. Indeed, the question arises as to whether the price our country is being asked to pay to curb a bogey of inflation may not be altogether too great a price. And whether, from the point of view of everyone except the dealers in money, it might not have been better to reduce the rates of interest instead of increasing them.

The Bankers Had a Better, Safer Choice—III

(By Jerry Voorhis)

To understand the full significance of the recent action of four-sevenths of the Federal Reserve Board in boosting interest rates, it is necessary to examine the strange phenomena of what is called the monetary system of the United States.

It hardly deserves the name of a "system," for it is based upon no reason or logic or justice or economic wisdom.

Most of the so-called money of the United States consists of what we call bank credit. Most of our business transactions are carried on not by exchange of cash but by the drawing of checks. "Money in circulation" is regularly defined as "cash plus demand bank deposits." And seldom does the cash amount to more than a fifth or a quarter of the "demand bank deposits." In December 1964, for example, our total money supply as reported by the Federal Reserve Board consisted of $34.2 billion of currency and $125.2 billion of demand deposits.

But the really important factor is how our money is created. For it is obvious that as our economy grows and our production and commerce increase, there must be additional money brought into circulation to accommodate the increased volume of business. And indeed this was the stated purpose of Congress when it passed the Federal Reserve Act in the administration of Woodrow Wilson.

Many people think the Government of the United States creates the money of our Nation—as indeed it should and as the Constitution provides.

But the Government does no such thing—except for the pennies and dimes and quarters which we use for change.

All the rest of our money is created by the private banking system. It is possible for the private banks to create money in the form of demand bank deposits because of what is called the fractional reserve system.

This means that if a bank has $10 million of demand deposits on its books—that is, if it owes its depositors $10 million which they think they have in the bank—then the bank is required to have in actual cash money not $10 million but only perhaps $1 million or $1,500,000 or at most $2 million. The exact amount of cash reserves which banks must have behind the demand deposits on their books is decided by the Federal Reserve Board and is called the reserve requirement. It may be 10 or 13 or 15 or 20 percent. It is never more than 20 percent, usually much less.

Consequently, if a bank has actual cash deposits in its vaults of $1 million and the reserve requirement is 10 percent, it can have on its books as much as $10 million to the credit of holders of its "demand bank deposits." In such a case it can create some $9 million of new money that did not exist before. It can do this by giving the borrowers checking accounts and entering on its books demand deposit credits for those borrowers. Furthermore, if it finds itself in need of additional reserves it can usually borrow them from the Federal Reserve bank in its district.

Now the proper definition of money inflation, as distinguished from price or cost inflation is this: Monetary inflation takes place when the amount of money in circulation is increasing faster than the flow of goods and services to be bought with money is increasing.

And under our so-called fractional reserve system, the way we get inflation is that the banks create more new demand deposits than are needed to keep up with the growth of the economy and the flow of trade.

The theory then of curbing inflation by increasing interest rates is that if the interest rates are higher fewer borrowers will borrow from the banks and the banks will therefore create less new money in the form of demand deposits.

But even if this works, it involves so many undesirable effects that a very heavy burden of proof should rest upon anyone taking such a step. It should be taken only by a body which has a direct responsibility to the American people and which is subject to the duly elected representatives of the people.

The Federal Reserve Board is neither so responsible nor so subject. And this is why Congressman Wright Patman, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, has introduced legislation which would make the Federal Reserve banks national institutions as they should be and make the Federal Reserve Board a body responsible to the Nation's duly elected administration.

Furthermore, even assuming that there is a real danger of inflation—a thesis far from proved at present—there is another very obvious remedy available to the Federal Reserve Board. This remedy is to increase the reserve requirements in the banks.

Such action would have the immediate effect of reducing the ability of the banks to create money. If they had to have, let us say, a 20-percent reserve instead of a 10-percent reserve, this would mean that their ability to create new demand deposit, or checkbook, money would be cut in two.

Why is this remedy not used by Mr. Martin and his three companions? Only they can answer that question. But increasing reserve requirements would be even more certain to curb any threat of monetary inflation that might possibly exist. The one thing, however, which it would not do would be to cause the value of money to go up and the monetary value of real wealth to go down. It, therefore, would not give the kind of bonanza to the creators of our money supply which increasing interest rates gives.

Could this be the reason why the four did not choose this course?

One additional question arises. How long should we wait to establish for our country a sound, effective monetary system, one wherein money would be created by the only agency which has a right to exercise that power—the Government of the Nation—and one wherein the possibility of either inflation or deflation could be forever prevented?

Cooperatives Keep Interest Down, Help Whole Economy—IV

(By Jerry Voorhis)

Certain financial institutions in the United States probably won't raise their interest rates even though the Federal Reserve Board has given them an excuse to do so.

The ones that won't raise their rates if they possibly can avoid it are cooperative financial institutions—the ones that belong to their borrowers.

The reason they won't raise their rates is that they will not want to. They'd hurt their owners if they did.

Credit unions, cooperative farm credit institutions, and mutual savings banks are in business to reduce the burden of debt, not to increase it. They exist because groups of people have created them to help each other by owning together the savings and lending institutions they need. These consumers of credit are not interested in raising interest rates to make more money for investors.

Credit unions did not raise their interest rates a few years ago when the Federal Reserve Board took action similar to that recently taken. This was because credit unions are in business to help their members reduce the burden of debt—not to increase it. Their motive is different.

Banks for cooperatives and other cooperative farm credit institutions raised their rates only slightly—because they get part of their money for making loans by sale of debentures in the money market. But even if cooperative farm credit institutions do raise interest rates somewhat, the net effect upon their owner-borrowers may not be to increase the cost of credit at all. For if as a result of the higher rates a bank for cooperatives, production credit association, or Federal land bank association increases its earnings, those earnings all belong to the borrower-owners and will be returned to them in patronage refunds. So the net interest rate may not be increased at all.

The difference lies in motive. If the motive, the reason for being in business is service and mutual aid, then a financial institution will keep its interest rates as reasonable as it can. And in so doing, such institutions are certain to exert a very beneficial competitive influence—for the protection of all borrowers, even those who borrow from investor-owned institutions.

The very fact that cooperative financial institutions are in existence provides our entire Nation with the best protection it can have at present against really extortionate interest rates. And they provide that protection in the best way it can be provided in a supposedly "free" economic order. That way is by the competition of businesses whose motive is mutual aid and the service of people.

Korean Premier Warns Us on Truce Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of South Korea has offered us some wise counsel on dealing with Communists as recorded in Roscoe Drummond's column in the New York Herald Tribune of January 7, 1966.

The South Koreans have good cause to know the enemy well, and I am sure their warning will not be lost on the administration.

The article follows:

KOREAN ASSAYS PEACE BASKET: WARNING ON TRUCE TALKS BY STATE THAT GOT BURNED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It would be well to read and ponder, side by side, comments by two of the more knowledgeable people on the Vietnam war:

The Vice President of the United States, HUBERT HUMPHREY: "All of the eggs are in one peacebasket, except the surrender of South Vietnam."

The Premier of South Korea, Chung Il Kwon: "We have already learned the lesson that, when free nations negotiate with a Communist country, the result is always disadvantageous to us."

There it is, well put by two officials who know what they are talking about—a full-bodied offer to Hanoi to negotiate everything but surrender and a full-bodied warning that such negotiations could be perilous bordering on the fatal.

The truce talks in Korea took 30 months, during much of which the Communists mounted their bloodiest attacks and now, nearly 13 years later, there is still no political settlement.

The United States, is, I think, absolutely right in offering unconditional talks, that is, in offering to Hanoi that it put everything it wants on the peace agenda and we'll do the same.

But, in doing so, Premier Chung's warning couldn't be more timely and more valuable.

The head of the one nation that went through such negotiations is saying that we must be everlastingly alert against the kind of negotiated settlement which will have within it the seeds of surrender of South Vietnam.

This makes it imperative that we search out in advance the point at which the seeds of surrender could be planted and be ready to stand at that point unwaveringly.

There will be numerous vulnerable areas of negotiation which will have to be watched. But the central and fateful danger is Hanoi's demand that the Government of South Vietnam be given over the the Communist National Liberation Front—which is the political arm of the Vietcong which is the guerrilla arm of North Vietnam.

Have no doubt about it, such an ingredient embedded in any settlement would in the end destroy South Vietnam's independence because the seeds of self destruction would be injected into its bloodstream. Even as powerful a leader as General de Gaulle saw that he had to get rid of the Communists in his government to save France.

For 10 years the Vietcong have been waging a war to take over the Government of South Vietnam. Is there any reason to think that with representatives of the Vietcong inside the Government they would be any less determined to take over?

One way to surrender South Vietnam is to allow those who have been fighting to destroy its Government to come in and help it govern.

Do the Communists permit an opposition party in any country they control or minority representation in any government they dominate? It is anathema to them. Example: Only a week ago the Communists fired a professor at the East Berlin Academy of Science because he dared advocate that a non-Communist parliamentary party be allowed in East Germany.

When and if Hanoi chooses the road to negotiation, its foremost aim will be to negotiate the Vietcong Communists into the Government of South Vietnam.

If we every yield on that point, we will indeed have negotiated the surrender of South Vietnam. This is why Premier Chung's warning that the negotiations will be perilous is timely and valuable.

Adroit Shift in Economic Plans Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the proposal currently before the House Ways and Means Committee reinstituting certain excise tax reductions reflects sound economic planning. It restores revenues which would otherwise be lost to the Treasury and would serve no great economic need if this action were not taken. The President's proposal serves to ease inflationary pressures without straining the normal economic growth which is essential to conduct our defense efforts in Vietnam and at the same time provide for a stable national economy at home.

The following article by Mr. Harold B. Dorsey, of the Washington Post, on January 17, 1966, makes a constructive analysis of the effect of President Johnson's proposals.

ADROIT SHIFT IN ECONOMIC PLANS LAUDED

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

NEW YORK, January 16.—Those who understand the unusual complications now influencing the formulation of the Government's fiscal policies will find it difficult to criticize the economic aspects of the President's state of the Union message.

Little complaint is being registered among business executives and investment managers in New York, at least up to this point. In fact, the evidence of the administration's desire to restrain the exceptionally sharp upward trend in the aggregate demand for goods and services is quietly applauded as a highly intelligent piece of economic reasoning.

Furthermore, this moderate shift in the thinking of the economic planners is being handled so diplomatically that there is no shock to confidence. The small group of men who have worked out the details and presented the facts to the public deserves a great deal of credit for both their skill and finesse. Although investors were very anxious to see whether the statement of fiscal policies would have inflationary or deflationary implications, their first view of the shape of those policies did not even cause a ripple, one way or the other, in security markets.

Within the past few weeks, most economists had come to agree that the primary question about the business outlook for 1966 was whether or not the indicated sharply rising demand for goods and services could be accommodated without squeezing supply and causing significant inflationary pressures on costs and prices.

The long-term upward trends in the size of the working force, in the physical capacity to produce goods and in output per worker are broadly recognized. But the evidence has suggested that these upward trends on the supply side would be outpaced on an intermediate-term basis by the increase in demand. Therefore it has appeared that the only way to avoid the consequent inflation pressures—again on an intermediate-term basis—was to cause a modest slackening in the upward trend of demand.

The administration indicated its intention to contribute to that objective when the President stated that total Government expenditures in the 1967 fiscal year, except for defense, would only increase $600 million over the current fiscal year. One item alone, over which the Government has no control, would account for this much increase in next fiscal year's expenditures—interest charges.

In addition to the increases in automobile and telephone excise taxes, the President recommended an acceleration in the payment of income taxes, without changing the actual tax rates or the total tax liabilities of the individual and corporate taxpayers.

Assuming that Congress acts promptly on these measures, it is estimated that tax receipts will thereby be boosted $1.2 billion for the current fiscal year ending next June 30 and $4.8 billion for the fiscal year beginning July 1. This means that the cash purchasing power of the private economy would be lower than otherwise by these sums in the next year and a half.

With a little slower uptrend in cash to spend, there may be a little slower uptrend in spending. But for the personal sector the amount of money involved is quite small. Corporate spending is not likely to be retarded very much because if the spending decision is sound, and is justified by sustained after-tax earnings, the corporations will probably resort to bank credit or the capital market for the necessary cash.

A major problem for economists at this juncture is to try to determine the degree to which the demand for goods and services of the non-Government sectors might be dampened down by (1) the January 1 increase in social security taxes, (2) the acceleration of income tax payments and (3) the higher interest rates. There is a pretty good chance that the slackening in the excessive current growth rate in such spending will be just about enough to make room for the rising trend in defense expenditures without either significant inflationary or deflationary effects on costs and prices.

The Threat From Below

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD T. HANNA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we found in an article published in the January edition of the organization organ called V.F.W. much of the general tenor of remarks we have previously made in the House regarding the importance of oceanography. We believe that the very fact that Mr. Kenneth Wilson was given the prime location in the magazine's pages indicates how urgent the organization thought the message was. It is also indicative of the mounting sense of urgency and concern that many of our citizens feel about this subject.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has a subcommittee under the able leadership of the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman LENNON, which has done yeoman service in this congressional session for this great cause. Regardless of the claims made upon us in other and contending directions, gentlemen, let us not diminish our support for a more aggressive, dynamic program in ocenography. The great benefits and profits to our economy that are potential in such effort strongly suggest it, but the threat to our security in its absence sternly demands it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the contents of Mr. Kenneth Wilson's article in full below and commend its serious and sober consideration by all:

THE THREAT FROM BELOW: RUSSIA FAR AHEAD OF UNITED STATES IN EXPLORING THE BOTTOM OF THE OCEAN

(By Kenneth Wilson)

Just as astronauts are exploring the universe, a less spectacular but no less important program is underway to probe the ocean and its floors, or "inner space," as these depths are called.

More and better knowledge of the seas is one of today's most important military problems. Strategists rate it at the top of their priority list.

Research in such fields as the physical and chemical properties of the ocean, temperature, and salinity, are essential to improving, detecting and tracking devices and techniques for antisubmarine warfare, for deep submergence and polar ice navigation. The sea floors—almost complete blanks on charts today—have to be mapped.

First it was the battleship that ruled the seas, then the aircraft carrier. Now, nuclear-powered submarines outmode all surface craft, bringing a completely new arena to naval warfare. The battlefield of the ocean floor is already a reality. To counterattack this imposing threat today, which many experts regard as far more serious than the threat of attack by air, some 90 percent of the U.S. Navy's efforts alone are directed toward anti-submarine activities.

Just before he retired as U.S. naval chief of operations, Adm. George Anderson was asked:

"Do you believe it is possible or probable we will work out a defense against missiles that might be lobbed or sent by ballistic force from submarines into this country in the event of war in future years?"

Admiral Anderson replied: "I have hopes, but no confidence at this stage of the game." The Admiral said that the Navy had used the best talent available but no one could cite anything that would be a measurable step forward.

The barrier, as all Navy technical men agree, is our lack of oceanographic knowledge.

In this vital field, Russia is well ahead of the United States. The Soviets have more than 60 full-time oceanographic research ships and at least a dozen oceanographic institutes. Assigned to the Ministry of Fisheries for oceanographic studies is the Soviet submarine *Severianka*, equipped with portholes and underwater TV and lighting, among other sophisticated gear. In all, there are more than 55,000 scientists and technicians engaged in Soviet oceanographic studies.

Of the much-publicized fleets of Russian trawlers operating off both coasts of the United States, all engage in oceanography research, if not in electronic spying on Western activities. With relatively simple measuring devices and only semiskilled crews, they continuously record data on currents, temperatures, salinity, magnetic and gravitational fields, and scores of other phenomena. Such a simple thing as daily reports on water temperatures from trawlers at hundreds of locations is of tremendous military value, particularly in the use of sound for discovering the presence of fast-moving submarines running deep.

But sound in water is even more eccentric than it is in the air, where sound waves may bounce over broad areas to be heard far beyond their source. Where warm and cold currents in the sea intermingle, listening devices run into all kinds of trouble. Thermoclines, or sharp differences in water temperatures, refract or divert a sonar's ping and provide ideal havens for prowling subs.

Unfortunately for the United States, some of the best thermoclines are to be found along the edges of the Gulf Stream, a comparatively short distance offshore and within easy missile-firing range of most of the cities and heavily populated parts of the eastern seaboard.

Weird underwater sound ducts caused by temperature variations, for example, can echo a merchant freighter miles away, or mask a submarine under the very nose of a search plane or ship. Differing temperatures, combined with pressure changes at great depths, also form sound channels. If the favorable areas are known, low-frequency signals can be sent thousands of miles. Large numbers of today's Red trawlers also carry electronic and photographic gear for ocean-bottom mapping.

Recently, I visited aboard the 6,000-ton Russian oceanographic ship *Mikhail Lomonosov* when it put into St. John's, Newfoundland. It is as big as a large ocean freighter and regarded as the most modern research vessel afloat. The chief oceanographer aboard, a member of Russia's Academy of Science, told me that the vessel worked with Red fishing trawlers in the Atlantic, receiving and processing their oceanographic information. Among projects on which the ship is engaged, he told me, are the mapping of the ocean bottom; high altitude meteorological observations; salinity tests; a study of how winds transmit energy to the surface of the water and an investigation of the process of interchange between atmosphere and sea.

The Russians have been hard at work on worldwide oceanographic studies for the past dozen years at least. It wasn't until 1959 that a National Academy of Science report focused attention on the lack of ocean research by the United States.

To find the answers to oceanographic questions which are fundamentally important in peace, critical in war, the report cited the need for doubling U.S. basic research in the marine sciences.

"In the period 1960–70," the report recommended, "the research, development and survey fleet should be greatly increased. This means that 70 ships should be constructed at a total estimated cost of $214 million. This is the minimum required to keep the United States abreast of scientific activity. First priority must be given to construction of research ships."

One of those research ships, the *Sealab II*, spent 45 days during September and October some 200 feet down on the Pacific Ocean floor off the California coast.

Inhabiting the $850,000 12- by 57-foot chamber were 3 crews of 10 aquanauts, including Astronaut Scott Carpenter, which each did a 15-day stint in this U.S. inner-space capsule. Daily, at least two of the aquanauts would don wet suits, breathing equipment, and venture out of *Sealab II* to explore the sea's mysteries.

Strange fish were tagged to observe their movements. The weird seascape of the under-ocean was photographed for later study and marine life specimens collected.

But the main purpose of the 45-day-long *Sealab II* project was to see how man can perform deep underwater. The conclusion was that man can live and work about as well on the ocean floor as on the earth's surface or, as the astronauts are proving, far out in space.

In the first Sealab experiment in 1964, four navymen stayed submerged for 15 days at a depth of 192 feet off Bermuda.

Such vessels, along with other advanced types, will go a long way toward lessening our profound ignorance of the seas. Today, man knows less about the ocean floor than he does about the face of the moon. For instance, an expedition from California's Scripps Institution of Oceanography to the South Pacific mapped an underseas mountain range some 12,000 feet high—about as tall as the Sierra Nevada Mountains and as long as the Coast Range from San Diego to Seattle—whose very existence was previously unknown.

Similarly, in the study of water during the last few years, two major ocean currents of very great size, each with a flow about 1,000 times that of the Mississippi River, have been discovered. One of these is an undercurrent running below the Gulf Stream but in exactly the opposite direction. The other is a fast-moving stream—200 miles wide and carrying a billion cubic feet of water a second—moving eastward, 1,000 feet below the surface, along the Equator.

Not all oceanographic research is aimed at military use. Fish studies are being carried out by dozens of nations. The United States is also studying how to extract hydrogen for energy from the seas. The goal is cheap electric power.

Increasingly, as we gain knowledge, the ocean floors are beginning to give up some of their vast store of mineral treasure—oil, gas, diamonds, gold, silver, platinum, iron, tin, and phosphate.

According to Dr. John L. Mero of the University of California, there is enough manganese, copper, cobalt, and nickel in the ocean depths to meet man's needs for a million years at present consumption rates.

As Joseph Conrad wrote: "The sea never changes, and its works, for all the talk of men, are wrapped in mystery."

This is true, but the wrappings are beginning to be unwound a little. Even so, our knowledge of the seas is still so meager that each new discovery now raises more questions than it answers.

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, never before in history has a government been involved in so many dubious undertakings and withheld as much information from as many people.

Government by secrecy, bribery, deceit, and corn has descended on Washington as the public relations policy of the present administration.

A most effective commentary on this situation is the "Report From Washington," by Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, which appeared in the January 19 edition of that newspaper.

The article follows:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON

(By Walter Trohan)

JOHNSON'S NEWS MANAGING POLICY GRADUATES INTO NEWS DENIAL

WASHINGTON, January 18.—News management, one of the hallmarks of the Johnson administration, has graduated into news denial, and there are some frightening parallels of the rigid control of news under a police state.

It has long been the fashion of Democrats in power to blast the press as opinionated and against their party. Franklin D. Roosevelt made it a theme song, which was adopted by Harry S. Truman and John F. Kennedy. Even though the overwhelming majority of the Nation's newspapers supported Lyndon Baines Johnson, he and his aids sing the old familiar notes.

President Johnson has virtually abandoned the press conference. He has confided to intimates that he can't keep his mind on questions and on presenting the best possible image on television at one and the same time. He prefers to read speeches rather than to face questions.

No one can maintain, except one whose livelihood depends upon Mr. Johnson, that this promotes, the public's right to know. The public was not told that a direct peace bid was made to Hanoi around Christmastime and still hasn't been told how or where the Communist North Vietnamese were approached.

ISSUED BY WHITE HOUSE

The State Department has been mum. So has the Pentagon. In fact, the entire Government has been rather effectively gagged. If any department or bureau has any important news, it is released through the White House. It is true that the White House holds briefings on important news, but those made available to press questioning at such briefings are officials who dare not compete with the President for news headlines by going very far beyond the language of whatever message or report is the subject of any briefing.

In the State Department or the Defense Department, reporters must get official approval before they can visit any official to get information on any subject he is interested in. Almost invariably, the official refuses to be quoted. The White House has criticized the press for "very poor judgment" and being "very poorly informed." If this be so, it is because the news managers have laid down the ground rules.

Now the press has learned of a curious espionage system within the Great Society under which the telephone calls of White House staff members are noted, including those of members of the press seeking information. The places staffers visit, including homes of newsmen, and the persons they see, including newsmen, are subject to check.

The White House says that this is being done to achieve operating economies. During the campaign year Mr. Johnson turned out the White House lights to let an economy image glow, but the budget has been set at $112.8 billion for the fiscal year which will begin July 1 and will undoubtedly run higher.

FOR CONVENIENCE OF L.B.J.

With the press protesting the abandonment of the full dress news conference, Bill D. Moyers, the White House press secretary, frankly stated that the news conferences are designed to serve the "convenience of the President, not the convenience of the press."

Moyers admitted that he had planted questions at news conferences to let the President "say what is on his mind." Of course, another object of the planted question is to capture headlines and editorials. More ominous was the Moyers statement that speculation in the press on what the President might or might not do "is to deny to the President that latitude he needs in order to make, in the light of existing circumstances, the best possible decision."

This does not square with the President's call for the help of the people. What it asks the press and the people to do is to wait until the great man acts, which would mean that the only role of the press and the people the President really favors is to applaud and give thanks for whatever he does.

This goes beyond news management. It would seem to be news control pure and simple, under which the administration is contending the President could be free to withhold the facts of any national situation, prevent frank and open discussion, and bar criticism. Police state, here we come.

Truth In Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate the other day, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware made some interesting comments, following President Johnson's state of the Union message. He referred to the President in his message having advocated new legislation to provide truth in packaging and truth in lending. The Senator suggested a third recommendation; namely, truth in government. He said that if the President wanted to protect Americans from misrepresentation he might well include protection of American taxpayers from misrepresentation with respect to the true cost of his administration's proposals and the truth about the Federal budget. The people, Senator WILLIAMS said, should know that the expenditures of this administration are the most extravagant in history.

President Johnson's request this week for a supplemental appropriation of more than $12 billion for financing of the war in Vietnam is a case in point with regard to budget juggling and withholding of information from the American people.

In other words, the President's request for these essential funds was deliberately delayed last year until all the Great Society programs had been funded. Now, Congress gets this emergency request for defense which must be funded when it is too late to make cuts in existing nonessential, nonmilitary programs.

As to truth in budgeting, the proposal of the President for a speedup in tax collections in this election year is another example of juggling the figures. The acceleration of corporate and individual income tax payments and the payment of self-employed social security taxes on a quarterly instead of annual basis will make the fiscal picture look better prior to the election next November, but by the fiscal year's end, the true situation will be apparent, when it is too late for voters to do anything about it.

Mr. Speaker, as pointed out by the minority party congressional leadership, Republicans intend to fully support needed appropriations for defense. On the other hand, it is our responsibility to scrutinize the administration's spending, and especially on nonmilitary appropriation requests, Mr. Speaker, we Republicans intend to do just that. We are frank in saying that in this time of stimulated prosperity and high employment, we think the public debt during the past 5 years should have been reduced instead of planned deficits exceeding $31,500 million. This present fiscal year, which ends June 30, will increase our huge national debt by another $6 billion and the legal debt ceiling will have to be increased again.

Of course, President Johnson did not admit this in his message, but instead predicted the deficit for fiscal 1967 would be reduced to only $1.8 billion.

As to this prediction, let me recall that a year ago, in his 1965 state of the Union message, President Johnson talked about continuing along the path toward a balanced budget. Actually, that 1965 path is now estimated to be a deficit of $7 billion for that year alone, not including $2,687 million resulting from accelerated corporate taxes approved last year.

But getting back to truth in government, the taxpayers of America have a right to know the facts. Indeed, the Treasury's own figures show the estimated deficit for 1967 will not be $1.8 billion, but rather it is given as $9.2 billion.

The difference in these two estimates is due largely to some nonrecurring items, which are shown as general revenue by the President. One of these is the $2.5 billion which the Government expects to receive over and above cost in the coining of new silver quarters and 50-cent pieces with a new low silver content. Also the President includes as revenue the proceeds from the sale of millions of dollars worth of materials from the defense stockpile. Good bookkeeping and truth in government, it seems to me, should require this income to be listed separately as special receipts. The President should have explained that his figure of a $1.8 billion deficit was based on Congress acceding to his request that tax collections in fiscal 1967 be accelerated so that $3.2 billion in taxes from corporations would reach the Treasury in fiscal 1967 instead of fiscal 1968.

The withholding tax acceleration for individuals suggested by the President would add another $400 million to this amount ahead or regular schedule.

This new juggling proposal is the same as obtaining an advance payment on a worker's next week's salary. In the end his finances are not improved. He is just as badly off.

Under these planned tax accelerations, plus the estimated profit on coinage, the Treasury would collect an extra $2,687 million in fiscal 1966 and $7,440 million in fiscal 1967; and, as I said, these are nonrecurring items. This situation should be shown and explained to the American people. Certainly, this information should not be withheld until after an election. Furthermore, right now when Congress is considering the advisability of a "guns and butter" policy, the true facts should be known. President Johnson, in asking Congress to continue his Great Society programs and at the same time to support the huge cost of the Nation's war in Vietnam, should spell out the truth as to our overall financial condition is essential.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has had billions of dollars of losses that have not been reimbursed. Likewise, the civil service retirement fund is owed approximately $40 billion by our Government. Obligations such as these are covered up and not openly mentioned.

So, Mr. Speaker, I fully support our Republican minority leader in calling for truth in budgeting and likewise in questioning the President's wisdom in calling for increased Federal spending on domestic, nonmilitary programs. The American people have always supported austerity in war time and the United States is at war, whether the administration cares to admit it or not. I do not mean cutting health research, or education or funds for the care and needs of the elderly. I mean cutting down on duplication and waste and delaying new low priority programs that can just as well wait until peace comes in southeast Asia.

The honest thing to do is to forgo political boondoggling Mr. Speaker, the country cannot afford it in peacetime, but even more so in time of war.

Restore Veterans' Pensions Cut by Social Security Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to restore non-service-connected veterans' pensions which have been reduced or eliminated because of the receipt of increased social security benefits.

Last year when the badly needed increase in cash social security benefits was enacted many of our veterans were moved into a higher income bracket. Since non-service-connected pensions are based on income limitations, some of our ex-servicemen and their widows had their pensions reduced or terminated entirely.

The income test for pension purposes is made up of only a few broad income brackets with very sharp drops in pension amounts as one moves to a higher bracket. The result is that the additional money received from the higher social security payment does not offset the loss in pension payments suffered by those pushed into a higher income bracket, to say nothing of those whose pensions were terminated entirely.

Most of the group whose pensions have been cut are disabled, on limited incomes, and in their advanced years. A reduction in their pension is a real hardship and the situation should be corrected. I hope the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will take action in the very near future.

Nashua Telegraph Pays Inspired Tribute to Richard Chaput

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on January 12, I paid tribute in the House, page A62, to Mr. Richard Raymond Chaput, author and public speaker who, although paralyzed by boyhood polio, was named 1 of the 10 outstanding young Americans of 1965 by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chaput was flown to St. Paul last Saturday to receive his award and, on February 3, the junior chamber of commerce in his home city of Nashua, N.H., will pay him further tribute at a testimonial dinner.

Mr. Chaput's hometown newspaper, the Nashua Telegraph, edited by Mr. Fred Dobens, paid its own tribute to Mr. Chaput last Monday in an inspired editorial. The national recognition won by Mr. Chaput is a source of immense pride to his community, a pride that is reflected beautifully in this editorial. I am honored to share it with my colleagues by placing it at this point in the Record:

RICHARD CHAPUT—AN INSPIRATION TO ALL

A lesson in courage—an inspiration to all—describe Nashua's Richard Chaput, who received a very distinguished honor Saturday night in St. Paul, Minn.

He was recognized by the U.S. Jaycees as one of the 10 outstanding young men of 1965. He travels in select company. Among the award winners were Astronauts Conrad and White and Presidential Secretary Bill D. Moyers.

And past honorees include the late President John F. Kennedy, Pat Boone, Leonard Bernstein, and former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Chaput's story needs telling and retelling. It represents a challenge, not only to those afflicted by sickness and physical handicaps but to those hale and hearty.

Despite being paralyzed completely from the neck down, he has become a successful author and a noted speaker.

Now 29, he has been bedridden since he was 9 when a severe attack of polio left him paralyzed. He still spends several hours daily in an iron lung.

What makes the Nashuan so outstanding is that he has accepted his situation. And through courage and perseverance, he overcame these hardships to make noteworthy contributions to society.

He was able to graduate from high school through private tutoring. Working with Rivier College, he mastered a home-study program equivalent to a bachelor of arts degree. He studied creative writing and English and his keen mind, coupled with high interest in this field, produced a contribution to society through writing.

But all this took desire and an unbeatable spirit in the face of his disabilities.

Aided by a specially designed typewriter activated by a stylus held in his teeth, and a tape recorder adapted to his requirements, he has written and sold scores of articles and short stories. In 1964, his autobiography, "Not To Doubt," was published.

Of this publication, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, said, " 'Not To Doubt' is the story of a young man, bedridden for many years. He found his place, Lord, in Your plans. He understands the meaning of suffering. So did I, after reading his story. I pray that every reader will profit by it in a like manner."

For years he has been an officer and a leader in the Nashua Friendship Club and he has been active in raising funds for this organization.

Residing in a nursing home, he ventures out on his portable cot to attend meetings of the Nashua Jaycees, the Friendship Club, the National Association for the Physically Handicapped, the Catholic Young Adult Organization, and others.

Last year both the Nashua Jaycees and the New Hampshire Jaycees selected him as their Young Man of the Year in separate awards. He was also the outstanding member of the Friendship Club in 1963.

The Jaycees will pay tribute to Chaput at a testimonial dinner in the Bishop Guertin High auditorium February 3.

And when all the facts are weighed, it is evident that Richard Chaput is indeed a shining example for all—a marvel despite his paralytic condition.

I Live on the Edge of Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, one of the great men of Ohio and of the Nation retired from active duty last month after most of a lifetime devoted to the creation of beauty, the conservation of resources and the protection of our national heritage for later generations to use and enjoy.

Bryce C. Browning has been the father, the driving force, the dreamer and the guiding genius of the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, a project that has transformed one-fifth of Ohio into a conservation wonderland that attracts acclaim from all over the world.

Fifty years ago this was an area of marginal and submarginal farms, mined out and subject to the devastation of floods. Today 10 beautiful lakes held to control floods while providing recreation for hundreds and thousands of people, and the surrounding hills and valleys show the rewards of a farsighted reforestation project that yields income for the conservancy district as well as conservation and recreation benefits for the entire area.

Bryce Browning was not content with flood control. He was not content to lock up the woods and hills like some kind of outdoor museum piece. He was not content to build only a playground. His vision produced the almost perfect blend of all of these: a project that prevents flood, conserves the soil, yields valuable timber, provides enjoyment for the naturalist, the camper, the millions who enjoy water sports and the city people who simply want to spend a day in the woods.

Moreover, this conservation project, unlike any other of which I am aware, pays for itself. It even pays real estate taxes on the land that it owns.

No one will ever know and few can imagine the hours and days of planning, pleading, selling, convincing and cajoling that were required before Bryce Browning could begin the creation of this wonderland. No one can measure the effort and energy he has devoted to it over the years. And no man has left a finer legacy for his neighbors and for all others all over the world who may be inspired by the Muskingum to do something similar in their own homelands.

I have been proud to be associated with Bryce Browning and to help a little bit along the way during my years in Congress. I hope our association will continue for many additional years as he enjoys his retirement.

Words of praise are nothing new to Bryce Browning, but I have the feeling that he cherishes especially a description of his project by Ohio Novelist Louis Bromfield, himself a noted conservationist, which was printed in the Saturday Evening Post some years ago. Mr. Bromfield's world famous farm was in Muskingum country and he referred to the project by saying "I live on the edge of paradise." Mr. Bromfield described the genesis of the project as follows:

"One April morning (in 1913) it began to rain—not merely a good heavy rain, but a downpour described by the natives as 'raining pitchforks and hay ladders.' It rained all that day and the next and the next and the next, steadily and violently. This was no sudden but brief cloudburst such as the West and the Southwest sometimes experience. It resembled more closely the 40 days and 40 nights of rain described in the Old Testament.

"For days the heavy rains continued without a break until even on the watershed of Ohio, in the highest part of the State, cities like my hometown of Mansfield were flooded. Trains on the transcontinental lines ceased running, powerhouses were flooded and cities were left without light or power. Flooded sewage plants polluted the water supplies, and residents of cities were forced to drive into the country to springs for safe supplies of water. Bridges were washed out and farmhouses swept away by such currents as the oldest inhabitant could not remember, while towns and sections of towns were submerged up to second-story windows.

"When the rains finally ceased and the waters had gone down a little, it was discovered that nearly 500 people had lost their lives and more than $300 million of property damage had been done. This became known, and will remain known so long as there is a State of Ohio, as the great flood of 1913.

"Now, Ohio is a State unused to disasters. It knew periodically the flooded lowlands along the Ohio River and its tributaries. People had grown accustomed to them, but the citizens of Ohio had no experience with wild tornadoes or forest fires or earthquakes, or the periodically disastrous floods familiar in some regions. They were resentful and indignant that Ohio should be visited by such a catastrophe.

"Fortunately, the indignation did not die away. The citizens, especially in the areas which suffered most, decided that something must be done about it.

"The citizens of the area which had suffered most in the valley and watershed of the Muskingum River, the biggest of Ohio's in-State rivers, finally drew up a plan known as the Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District. It became a reality in 1933, and since then has operated to the benefit of those in the watershed itself.

"The area was organized as a public corporation with the power to plan and to construct and administer flood control and conservation projects, issue bonds, and levy assessments and taxes. It also possessed the power to enter into contracts with the Federal Government or the State of Ohio for cooperation in any project undertaken. Making decisions for the corporation were a board of common pleas judges and a board of elected directors.

"It has created handsome forests and helped vastly to check all the destructive erosion which was eating up rapidly some of the finest agricultural land in the world. It has created a necklace of 10 beautiful lakes as lovely as any to be found in the English lake country. There is boating, bathing, fishing, camping and hunting close at hand for the Ohio millions who live in great industrial cities like Cleveland, Youngstown, Akron, Toledo, Columbus, Cincinnati, Dayton, and many smaller industrial communities. City dwellers need drive only a couple of hours at the most to find beautiful lakes and some of the finest fishing in the world."

In closing, I include with my remarks an editorial tribute to Mr. Browning from the Canton Repository:

MEMORIAL TO BRYCE BROWNING

Ever since the devastating flood of 1913 left a toll of life and property loss on Zanesville, Bryce Browning has known his calling was conservation.

The Muskingum Watershed Conservancy District, which extends into Tuscarawas County, was the first great one in this State and credit for it goes to no individual more than Bryce Browning.

During the more than 30 years since its start he has seen it reduce flood losses along the Ohio River and its Muskingum watershed tributaries many times at a savings of many millions of dollars.

The U.S. Corps of Engineers has followed the same pattern of flood control elsewhere in the Ohio Valley and along other rivers.

The success of the Muskingum project showed the way. The idea of damming small streams to hold back heavy runoff during periods of excessive rainfall is catching on in more and more areas. It not only reduces flood losses but helps preserve the upstream water tables.

Mr. Browning has been generous with his genius. He has helped develop the gorgeous Atwood Lake area and has served as consultant and inspiration in other areas seeking to duplicate the Muskingum feat.

He described his career perhaps best himself when he said his entire vocation, avocation, and vacations have been tied up with conservation.

Now, at year's end, he has retired officially from active participation.

But it is safe to predict Bryce Browning will not remain completely inactive. He is sure to be unable to resist heeding any call for help where he might be of help. And his name and works will live for generations.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, amidst our preoccupation with a struggle being waged by South Vietnamese and United States forces in the jungles and rice paddies and cities of Vietnam, we pause to remember the fate of another people—who also struggled, who lost, but who have not given up hope. January 22 is the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, an occasion not for celebrations but for tributes to the valor of Ukrainian martyrs and to the noble efforts of a long-suffering people. Indeed, 5 years ago, when we observed the centennial of the Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko, we were reminded that by eloquent words as well as by valorous deeds, Ukrainians have contributed to the cause of freedom and independence everywhere.

For over 300 years, the people of the Ukraine dreamed of independence while suffering under the oppression of Russian czars. Then as the czarist regime crumbled during 1917, the long-awaited opportunity came. A group of Ukrainian patriots declared their intention to seek independence in December 1917, and declared it achieved on January 22, 48 years ago. The newly independent Ukraine was a war-torn country, however, surrounded by aggressive and feuding neighbors. The preservation of independence was to prove impossible. The Red army invaded the Ukraine in the spring of 1920. In 1923, the Ukraine was made a constituent republic of the Soviet Union; the Ukrainians were among the first victims of a new imperialism.

The Ukraine experienced no respite during World War II. As in World War I, the country became a battlefield for the contending forces of East and West. The Soviets withdrew only to be replaced by other cruel masters—the Nazis. Following World War II, Soviet authority was reasserted, and tightened. Cruelest of ironies, the Ukrainians, on Soviet insistence were given a delegation to the United Nations. But this delegation is a sham. The facade of independence cannot disguise the ugly fact of subservience.

The Ukraine has a population of more than 45 million, and a territory which exceeds in area that of several Western European nations combined. The Ukraine is rich in human and material resources; the history and culture of the Ukraine are more than a thousand years old. In an era which has seen the rise of many new nations, some of them throwing off colonial bonds after long periods of subjugation, is it not a singular injustice that the Ukrainians along with their neighbors in Eastern Europe continue to be subject to exploitation by the worst colonial system of modern times?

Today, as we fight in southeast Asia on behalf of a small, brave people striving to maintain its freedom and independence, let us not forget that there are many areas of the world where the cause of liberty has yet to prevail, and that we must not relax our vigilance or abandon our struggle until that cause has prevailed.

Morris Weinberg—Four Score and Ten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today the family and many friends of Morris Weinberg will join with him and his wife Dora in celebrating his 90th birthday and their 65th wedding anniversary.

For more than 50 years Morris Weinberg has been an outstanding journalist and one of the most dynamic forces in American Jewish life.

Morris Weinberg founded the Day-Jewish Journal in 1914, but his career in journalism began when he arrived in this country from the Ukraine in 1894.

If more of our present-day journalists would follow the principles that Mr. Weinberg has lived by, we would have much better mass media helping to promote peace and prosperity at home and abroad. I am pleased to add my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for his continued good health and many more years of useful service to our Nation and a hearty "mazeltov" to his good wife.

The following article from the Synagogue Light briefly describes some of the many accomplishments of Mr. Weinberg during his long public career:

The Light of the Day

(By Stanley Garten)

The saying, "there's no business like show business," which is the title of a current motion picture, can well be challenged by the career of Mr. Morris Weinberg, publisher of the Day and Jewish Morning Journal, one of the Yiddish daily New York newspapers.

Mr. Weinberg's connection with the newspaper business started when he came to this country from the Ukraine in 1894, at the age of 18, and became a copyboy on the Abendblatt, an important paper at that time. By 1900 he had accumulated enough capital to be one of the founders of Metropolitan News Co., a wholesale distributor of newspapers in New York. Selling his interest in that company shortly after the company was established, he started the Weinberger News Co. in Brooklyn.

His first venture as a newspaper publisher was the Brownsville Jewish Post, a Yiddish paper for the Brownsville section of Brooklyn, which was a forerunner of other neighborhood papers in various parts of this city. Between 1900 and 1914, Brownsville was the focus of much Jewish settlement and many newly arrived immigrants from Eastern Europe went to live there. Mr. Weinberg went there in about 1901. Characteristically, almost as soon as he came there, he became one of the founders of the Brownsville and East New York Dispensary, where the poor could get medical aid at little or no cost. He was also active in establishing the Brownsville Labor Lyceum and in founding Talmud Torahs. For many years he was the president of the National Hebrew School Machzikei Talmud Torah.

To meet the need for housing of the thousands of newcomers to Brownsville, Mr. Weinberg engaged in building construction on a large scale, but retained his interest in journalism and acquaintance with Jewish writers. He was so well regarded by the Yiddish-writing journalist that in 1906, when the writers for the Jewish Morning Journal went on strike, they sent a committee to Mr. Weinberg to enlist his aid. Going among his friends in Brownsville in their behalf, Mr. Weinberg raised money for them in what was, at that time, a fair sum.

Mr. Weinberg's activities in building houses were, however, more actively interrupted a few years later, during the fateful year 1914 at about the time of the outbreak of World War I. During that summer, while Mr. Weinberg was building two apartment houses on Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, he was asked to become one of the founders of a new Yiddish daily. Associated in this project were Rabbi J. L. Magnes, who was greatly interested in the establishment of a United Jewish Community or Kehiliah; the great philanthropist Jacob Schiff and his son-in-law, Felix Warburg, and several others. Despite the burden of his other enterprises, Mr. Weinberg consented to make an investment in the proposed newspaper, with the understanding that one of the other parties would actively manage the paper; but, at the last minute, that party withdrew, both as investor and manager, and Mr. Weinberg found himself catapulted into the position of publisher or manager of the newspaper, the Day. His plan was to issue a Yiddish daily which would be not merely the house organ of a political party or the vehicle of its editor's prepossessions and which would not represent either the extremely conservative or ultraradical viewpoints of the other Yiddish papers, but to express the sentiments and opinions of the more modern and impartial liberal element of the intelligent middle class, including their Zionist outlook, and to afford a means for disseminating the new Jewish literature and encourage literary creativity of a kind that was desired by the large public who were without what Mr. Weinberg thought was representation in the Yiddish press of those days.

The Day quickly established its place in competition with the other Yiddish papers and rose to a circulation of 100,000 daily.

In 1923, Mr. Weinberg retired from ownership and management of the Day. For the next 18 years he was in banking and building construction. Late in 1941, he received an urgent call to resume the ownership and direction of the Day. Eight months earlier, the editorial and composing room staffs of the Day had bought the paper from the estate of David Shapiro, one of Mr. Weinberg's former associates. Unfamiliar with management techniques, the new owners soon found themselves in difficulties arising from a strike by the paper's Guild unit. To save the paper, they called Mr. Weinberg back to resume its direction. Reluctantly, he agreed and bound himself to accept no salary for 3 years. In less than that time he had the paper back on solid ground and added 10,000 circulation.

Previously, the Day had absorbed one of its competitors, the Warheit, which was a prosperous daily when the Day began publication. In 1953, came another merger, when the old Jewish Morning Journal, after 53 years of existence, was purchased together with its weekly magazine, the Jewish American. Today there are only two major Yiddish-language newspapers in New York—the Day and the Forward, both morning and Sunday.

Despite his many interests and the vagaries of Yiddish newspaper management, Mr. Weinberg has always been active in many fields of Jewish endeavor. Mr. Weinberg has always been an ardent Zionist, serving on the executive board of the Zionist Organization of America for many years and for several years as treasurer. He was long a director of the United Palestine Appeal and of the United Jewish Appeal. He was one of the founders of the Hebrew Free Loan Association (Gemillot Chasodim). He was a director of Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, HIAS, and in 1921–22, as the representative of HIAS, traveled on a U.S. diplomatic passport to investigate and report concerning those who wanted to emigrate to the United States, carrying on his work in all the ports of Europe—Hamburg, Bremen, Havre, Marseilles, Southampton, etc. He has been abroad at least 10 times.

He has been cochairman of drives on behalf of Israeli bonds, and, previously, had been cochairman of many drives for United Palestine Appeal and United Jewish Appeal.

For a number of decades, he has been consulted as one of the elder statesmen of ZOA.

He was a founder of the Brooklyn Jewish Center, the largest Conservative synagogue in this country, and has been one of its trustees since its inception in 1919.

Mr. Weinberg married Dora Rubin in 1900.

They have three children, two daughters and one son. Their eldest daughter, Ruth W. Jacobs, is the wife of Arthur L. Jacobs, general manager of the "Day." Their son, Goodwin G. Weinberg, is assistant to the publisher. Their daughter Naomi is married to Solomon Bochner, professor of mathematics, Princeton University, and a member of the Academy of Science.

Mr. and Mrs. Weinberg have three grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

One of the important posts in which Mr. Weinberg has rendered public service, and, as always in his public career, without pay, was when he served as a trustee of Bellevue and Allied Hospitals. There were two Catholics, two Protestants, and two Jews on this board. Mr. Weinberg was the first East European Jew ever to be appointed to it. He served for 11 years, which was by far the longest period anyone had ever held this office. During his tenure of that office, he was able to protect the interest of Jewish interns and employees from anti-Semitic discrimination and did not hesitate to assert and strongly contend for fair treatment of all. Previously there had been a tendency to shrug off such practices and to avoid forthright discussion of grievances of the Jewish members of the staffs of these hospitals. Mr. Weinberg, however, believed in open consideration of these matters and in firmly opposing injustice and oppression based on bigotry or religious prejudice.

He was equally firm and courageous in formulating and following the policy of "The Day." In the history and development of the Jewish community of New York during the crucial years since 1914, when the "Day" began publication, this newspaper played a significant part and Mr. Weinberg, as its publisher, exercised an important influence. The

First World War created difficult problems for many Americans of foreign birth or their descendants, whether Jews or Christians. The Irish had no love for England and the Jews had good reasons for antipathy to czarist Russia. Many of our native-born Americans, who had been students under German-educated college professors, had a high regard for German "Kultur." There was also a widespread belief that this was a war between great imperialist powers engaged in a struggle for commercial advantages. The traditional American desire to avoid "foreign entanglement" was very strong and was reinforced by the desire to keep out of wars which seemed to seek territorial aggrandizement with which we were not concerned. Not until our own entry into this war on April 6, 1917, was it easy to get many people to see that, despite their dislike of Russia and England, the danger to world freedom, including our own, was German militarism. The national election of 1916 had been very close and the slogan of the victorious Democratic Party on behalf of President Wilson had been: "He kept us out of war." The years of World War II preceding our entry also raised stormy disputes. All of these issues were reflected in the "Day." Jews whose forebears had come here from Germany often seemed patronizing toward East European Jews who felt that they were treated as poor relations. The numerically larger groups of these more recent immigrants many of whom were increasingly successful in business and other activities, resented this and the relations between these two groups were often strained.

The "Day," under the guidance of Mr. Weinberg, followed a policy of sturdy self-respect for the new Americans of the Jewish groups who had come here from Eastern Europe. It was neither the moss-back conservatism of the older Yiddish dailies nor the "class-conscious" socialism of the radicals. "The Day" was not chauvinistic on behalf of any group nor a sycophant of any other element. The courage and wisdom of Mr. Weinberg, through the medium of the "Day," led to a better understanding and rapprochement among New York Jews which was most beneficial.

The "Day" has also maintained a high standard of literary values, thanks to Mr. Weinberg's good judgment.

This is of great importance to Yiddish papers, as their content differs from the dailies published in English in New York, in consisting of many items of a cultural nature, like special articles, serialized novels, short stories and a "feuilleton." All of these features carry the name of the author. The articles deal with a wide range of subjects; some of current general news interest, some with developments of particular concern to Jews; others discuss social, political or economic problems. The "Day" has an article in its Friday issue concerning the Scriptural portion of the week. In short, the proportion of "straight" news reporting is far less in the Yiddish papers than in the English dailies and a substantial part of the paper consists of what might be called magazine material. The "feuilleton" is an article, usually in a lighter vein than the other special articles, and which frequently deals with literary topics. It is not a book review. Its prototype appeared in continental papers when they were at their best, before the world war.

Mr. Weinberg's career in the newspaper business has thus covered over 65 years of the most critical period of the Yiddish daily in America. He saw the circulation of these papers rise to impressive numbers and saw it greatly decreased as the result of the practical cessation of immigration since our "quota law" was enacted in 1924. He has nevertheles continued to maintain the higher standards he set for "The Day" and is still a great influence for enlightenment and democracy in the Jewish community of New York. May that influence long continue as the light of "The Day."

Robert C. Weaver—Excellent Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the President has made an excellent choice of Mr. Robert C. Weaver as the newest addition to his Cabinet. As a member of the Housing Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have known and worked closely with Mr. Weaver during the years he has been Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I have come to respect and admire the ability and intelligence he has displayed in that position. I am confident he will be outstanding as this Nation's first Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 17 at this point in the RECORD:

A NEW URBAN ERA

President Johnson has set in motion the machinery which could implement long-advocated but often-frustrated changes in the pattern of urban living. On Thursday the President appointed Dr. Robert C. Weaver to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The establishment of the new department, designed to give the cities a voice in the Federal Government, was itself delayed for years by a negative attitude in Congress.

The day before the Weaver nomination, the President in his state of the Union message outlined two objectives with which the Department of Housing and Urban Development will be vitally concerned. He called for Federal legislation to prohibit racial discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. And bearing in mind the great urban slums that symbolize racial discrimination, the President said:

"We must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing, in some cases, as many as 100,000 people. Working together, private enterprise and government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where our people can come to live the good life."

As a housing expert and a Negro, the first of his race to be a member of the President's Cabinet, Dr. Weaver will be able to give both knowledge and understanding to the achievement of the new goals of his department. In bringing together various Federal agencies concerned with housing and urban affairs (including the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which Dr. Weaver now heads), the 1965 law already provides for the organizational structure of the new department. But the role of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in revitalizing urban life will depend on the leadership of the new Secretary, as well as on the response of the President and Congress to the still undisclosed proposals of a special presidential study committee on urban affairs appointed last fall.

The President and Congress will also shape the proposed new Federal weapon against discrimination in housing. Though Mr. Johnson did not give any details of the recommended law, it would presumably cover all housing that is directly or indirectly aided by the Federal Government. An executive order against racial discrimination in housing has been in effect since 1962, but it applies only to construction with mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans' Administration, which means that it covers only about 17 percent of housing starts. If Congress should by law extend the ban against discrimination to mortgages handled by any federally supervised or aided lending institutions, the impact on racial barriers in the housing market would be far reaching.

By activating the new department and urging effective Federal action to end arbitrary curbs on the purchase of housing, the President has laid the groundwork for a new era of quality and equality in city life.

The Great Debate: Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we in the minority party here in the House of Representatives insist on a full and complete debate on the foreign policy of this country in this session of the Congress.

It is evident from the many statements being made even by members of the President's party in Congress that there is not an awareness of the short-term aims and long-term objectives of our Nation's policy in Vietnam.

This week, my friend and colleague, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, made some very significant statements questioning the policies of the Johnson administration's escalation of the war in Vietnam on the ground during the last 12 months. In June, I first raised a similar question about the planned escalation of our ground forces in Vietnam. In 12 months we have increased our ground forces from 20,000 men to 200,000 men. Are we indeed drifting toward a major ground war in Asia? Are we giving these fighting men adequate protection and support? Are we properly using our conventional sea and air power in Vietnam? Has a stable government been established in South Vietnam? These questions and many like them must be answered before those of us on the Defense Appropriations Committee approve President Johnson's new request for an increase in regular ground forces of the Army and Marines.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the January 17 editorial, which appeared in the Marshfield News Herald, entitled "The Senator Is Right." I also include the Milwaukee *Journal* interview which appeared on Sunday, January 16, which served as the basis for the News Herald's editorial.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Marshfield (Wis.) News Herald, Jan. 17, 1966]

The Senator Is Right

We find ourselves in general agreement with Senator Nelson's statement in his interview with the Milwaukee Journal Sunday in which he declared that for more than a year he had "considered each step of the escalation of the war in Vietnam as a tragic mistake."

He labeled as completely fraudulent the administration's argument that if Vietnam were lost, American commitments elsewhere would be meaningless and many other countries would fall to communism.

This is a bold declaration for a Democratic Senator to make in the face of the Johnson push for stepping up the war in Asia if North Vietnam and the Vietcong continue to refuse to join the United States at the peace table. Senator Nelson must have given the situation long and careful study over the past year.

We have felt from the outset that we should not, as a Nation, be involved in a shooting war in Vietnam. We agree with Nelson that President Eisenhower had no thought of sending American soldiers to fight in southeast Asia. At the most, he sent them there as advisors; our great fear was that eventually we would become involved in the conflict, and so it has come about.

It is not the intention of the American people, in our opinion, to attempt to dominate world affairs through force of arms. Thinking people admit our inability to establish a stable government in South Vietnam. The present Premier promises the establishment of a constitution by October and the election of a stable government thereafter. There hasn't been a semblance of stability since this Government entered the picture in South Vietnam and there is no sign of it right now. Our great fear is that the South Vietnamese people might ask us to leave their country because we are doing a vast amount of destruction in our efforts to drive the Vietcong out of the area.

We think President Johnson should take another look at our foreign policy; where our present tactics may lead us as a nation is terrifying to contemplate. Senator Nelson does well to put his opinions on the line for all to study. We are glad to note his willingness to lead the opposition to our southeast Asian policy. He can be more effective than Republicans because their opposition might be considered political rather than sincere and honest opinion.

We can hope that Congress will debate our foreign policy in the present session. It is most unfortunate that the war has escalated to the point where nearly 200,000 soldiers are in Asia and more are being prepared to move into battle. We must give the administration credit for striving to bring North Vietnam to the peace table and, in this respect, we agree with Senator Nelson when he said that there are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America, but of all the alternatives, the wisest choice is to continue to seek a negotiated settlement while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further.

There will be criticism of Senator Nelson's statement. Some of it will come from the fighting men in Asia who may feel he is undermining them in their fight to bring stability to South Vietnam. This is understandable, as they remember their fallen comrades who they hope have not died in vain. But the tragic fact is that unless hostilities are stopped, the conflict may go on for years with attendant human losses, because we are doing the very thing the Communists want us to do—expand our manpower and resources without accomplishing our purpose.

We hope Senator Nelson's statement is carefully considered by the Congress in the coming session. The Nation must take a second look at the southeast Asia situation; we must analyze the dangers of further escalation of the conflict which, after all, is not a declared war but which is just as deadly dangerous to the Nation and its people.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Jan. 16, 1966]

Escalation of War Tragic

(By John W. Kolf)

Washington, D.C.—Senator Nelson, Democrat, of Wisconsin, said Saturday that for more than a year he had "considered each step of the escalation of the war in Vietnam as a tragic mistake."

Nelson also labeled as "completely fraudulent" the administration argument that if Vietnam were lost American commitments elsewhere would be meaningless and many other Asian countries would fall to communism.

Only Wednesday night, President Johnson reaffirmed this theory in his state of the Union address by warning that if the United States yielded in Vietnam it would "abandon much of Asia to the domination of Communists."

The Senator thus issued his clearest challenge yet to Johnson's conduct of Vietnam policy.

VOTED AGAINST FUNDS

In May, Nelson was one of only three Senators who voted against Johnson's request for an emergency $700 million Vietnam appropriation.

His protest, however, was more against the haste in which the measure was jammed through Congress than the substance of the request.

There also have been times when Nelson has been unusually silent on Vietnam.

One such occasion was in July, when he declined to comment on Johnson's announcement that 50,000 more men would be sent to Vietnam and the draft would be doubled.

ADMISSIONS CLAIMED

In an interview, Nelson was asked to elaborate on his position that the so-called domino theory—that other non-Communist Asian nations would fall if Vietnam was lost—was fraudulent.

"I have had top administration officials admit this to me privately," he said. "For example, let us say we did get out of Vietnam. I can't believe that Red China would then conclude that it could attack India. If it did, we obviously should go right in and defend India."

COMMITMENT DENIED

The crucial difference, Nelson said, is that India and a number of other Asian countries have viable governments. Such is not the case in South Vietnam, he said, because the Government is largely our creation and lives only by our support.

Nelson said he believed that the Johnson administration had seriously exaggerated our commitment in Vietnam during the last year. He said it was clear that former President Eisenhower never contemplated such involvement back in 1954.

"We never made a commitment to any government in South Vietnam," he said.

If and when free elections are held throughout Vietnam, Nelson added, he would not be disturbed if the country did come under Communist control.

"I just can't see that such a small country is all that important in the world power structure," he said.

Nelson, who was back in Wisconsin Saturday for the start of a 10-day speaking tour, conceded that "there are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America in Vietnam."

WARNS OF "SLAUGHTER"

"But of all the grim alternatives, the wisest choice is to continue with great patience to seek a negotiated settlement while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further," he said.

Nelson said he believed that there was "no practical hope in achieving our aims" through escalation.

He warned that escalation carried with it "a very real possibility of an Asian-wide war in which America would waste her resources and young men in a slaughter that could achieve nothing but those desperate conditions of chaos ideal for the spread of communism."

Nelson said he agreed with George F. Kennan, the foreign policy expert and former Ambassador to Russia, who recently advocated a campaign to deescalate the Vietnam war.

"In a world where a nuclear holocaust is a distinct possibility, the survival of us all depends on containing armed conflict to as narrow an area as possible," the Senator said.

WANTS PAUSE CONTINUED

Nelson added that the pause in the bombings of North Vietnam—now in its fourth week—should be continued indefinitely unless there was some compelling reason for resumption.

He said that, through the pause "President Johnson has taken a long step toward localizing the war and achieving negotiations."

Almost a year and a half ago, in August 1964, Nelson spent parts of 3 days on the Senate floor to argue against giving Johnson a blank check in Vietnam.

"Our basic mission in Vietnam * * * is one of providing material support and advice," he said then. "It is not to substitute our Armed Forces for those of the South Vietnamese Government, nor to join with them in a land war, nor to fight the war for them.

"I personally feel it would be very unwise under any circumstances to put a large land army on the Asian Continent."

There is some indication, however, that Nelson's periodic reticence on the subject is now at an end. After Johnson's state of the Union message, the Senator called for extensive congressional debate on Vietnam.

IT WOULD BE INSANITY

Nelson said Saturday that "our top military leaders agree that it would be insanity for the United States to become engaged in a large Asian land war."

He said that even if a million American soldiers (there are about 190,000 there now) were sent to win the war in Vietnam, and an open clash with Communist China was avoided, "we would leave behind us only a charred, desolate country with little hope that it could maintain its independence one moment beyond the time we left."

BOMBS DIDN'T HELP?

Nelson said it was important to recall that "our military advisers have been consistently overoptimistic when not actually dead wrong in their public statements of the Vietnamese situation.

"Defense Secretary McNamara's estimate that the Americans could begin to pull out by Christmas 1965 is only the most famous example," he said.

"Those who look for a cheap victory through airpower should recall the glowing assurances last February that a few bombs on North Vietnam would quickly bring that country to the conference table in a tractable mood. If anything, the opposite has been the case."

Nelson's comments demonstrated more clearly than ever how much his views on Vietnam conflict with those of Wisconsin's other Senator, Democrat William Proxmire.

Only last week, Proxmire declared that the war was "the price we must pay."

Housing Groups Express Bitter Disagreement With Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last week the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee conducted an important hearing into the effects of rising interest costs on home buyers and home builders. My good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania, BILL BARRETT, who is chairman of the subcommittee, is to be commended for undertaking a study of an issue so vitally affecting millions of Americans.

Without question, the homeowners and would-be homeowners were a forgotten group when the Federal Reserve Board decided in secret on December 3 to raise interest rates. The Federal Reserve's action threatens to place a massive veto on the Nation's housing programs and threatens to place decent housing out of the reach of many citizens.

Rising interest costs and a tightening money supply always hit the home buyer and the building industry hard. For example, a 1-percent increase in the interest rate on a $20,000 home adds more than $4,700 in interest costs over the life of a 30-year loan. With the national median income at $4,600, this means that many wage earners will have to contribute a year's income just to pay the added interest costs.

Nearly everyone in the housing field is deeply concerned about the implications of the Federal Reserve's recent action. The National Housing Conference has denounced the Federal Reserve Board's action in forthright terms. I place in the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference on December 13, 1965:

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the National Housing Conference in regular quarterly meeting assembled on December 13, 1965, shares the concern expressed by President Johnson on the impact of the Federal Reserve Board's action in increasing the discount rate, particularly on the housing economy.

This further impetus to rising interest rates cannot fail to have an adverse effect on housing production and financing. It will mean increased costs to the consumer and a tighter mortgage market, and could result in a serious slowdown in homebuilding in the coming year.

This is no time to allow housing production to drag. Congress has given the President a far-reaching set of programs to bring our production of good housing closer to our rising needs and to speed up the improvement and redemption of our urban areas. It has established a consolidated agency to effectuate this mission by creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We must not now erase these hopes by diverting and denying adequate financing to the housing market and the people who need housing. Already, as interest rates have risen, the annual homebuilding rate by October had declined to the lowest point since January 1963. We must reverse this trend, not accelerate it.

We urge the President and the Congress to take such actions as may be necessary to assure an ample flow of mortgage financing at reaonable rates into housing production. We recommend that the President make full use of the new and expanded programs for housing for the low- and moderate-income group, as contemplated in the 1965 legislation, and to implement these programs administratively as quickly and fully as possible. We recommend also that the Congress, as it did in 1958, give the President standby authorization for the purchase of mortgages on the private market at the present interest rates through the Federal National Mortgage Association to counter any decline in housing production as the spring building season gets underway. Any setback in the housing economy at this time would have serious and costly consequences for the Nation for years to come.

The War on Poverty and Federal Manpower Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, a major contribution to the success of last summer's Republican intern program was made by a distinguished Georgetown University professor of economics who supervised it, George Viksnins. During his 3 months with us, Dr. Viksnins also researched the poverty program and made arrangements for the hearings conducted by the Republican task force on economic opportunity.

Recently, he addressed the Industrial Relations Research Association on the subject of manpower policy. I feel the views contained therein would be of value to all Members of the Congress, and therefore, I wish to insert Dr. Viksnins' statement at this point in the RECORD:

THE WAR ON POVERTY AND FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES

(By George J. Viksnins)

Let me confess that I come before you flying false colors or something like that, since my primary field of interest is monetary policy. However, during the past summer I was fortunate in being able to learn a considerable amount about the field in which all of you are knowledgeable. This summer was spent working with the task force on economic opportunity, which is one of a number of study groups working with the Republican conference of the House of Representatives. Our primary concern last summer was an investigation of the war on poverty and the examination of possible alternatives, in terms of both content and form. I shall return to a few of these alternatives, but first let me try to construct a reasonably general framework.

During the past 5 to 10 years a major difficulty encountered by the economy has been the combination of unreasonably high unemployment rates with varying degrees of price increase. The stability of wholesale prices and the relatively minor increase in consumer prices, which we experienced from 1958 to 1964, were in effect "bought" at the price of unemployment rates well above 5 percent. On the basis of this crude relationship, the economy seems to be incapable of attaining full employment; that is, 4 or, preferably, 3 percent of the labor force out of work—without inflation. To put it in another way, the aggregate supply curve becomes inelastic before full employment levels of production are reached. An analysis of why this is the case is beyond our scope here, but one part of the solution undoubtedly involves manpower policy. It can be taken as virtual article of faith that a skilled and mobile labor force would shift the curve and/or change its elasticity.

Thus, to begin with a definition: manpower policy involves programs to match the skills of workers with job requirements and their location with job availability. Whether manpower policies are best carried on by the Federal Government is an important and serious question, but it is, of course, quite unfashionable to ask it. At present, the vast majority of manpower programs are still carried on by private business and local (both State and municipal) government. The Federal Government's relatively recent entry in this field provides a marginal contribution, but its influence will continue to grow, hopefully, not at the cost of eliminating entirely private and local efforts.

Federal manpower programs, as the term is commonly understood, involve the Department of Labor and the Office of Economic Opportunity. We might note, parenthetically, that at the limit all Federal expenditures have manpower implications in both demand and supply terms. Certainly, shifts in the Defense Department's budget, such as from manned long-range bombers to missiles, will create an excess supply of bomber pilots and a shortage of missile button pushers, not even to speak of the stresses created in the production of these items. Coming closer to the traditional meaning of the term "manpower policy," the various programs of the Office of Education are certainly important in affecting labor supply. Vocational education and the important work in vocational rehabilitation carried on by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and the Veterans' Administration are obviously relatively similar to that of the two agencies discussed in further detail below.

First, the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor is responsible basically for occupational training associated with the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. Although amended in 1963, this set of programs gives priority to older workers: in particular, to unemployed, experienced workers (those who have had at least 2 years of gainful employment") and to members of farm families whose income is less than $1,200. Manpower Development and Training Act trainees normally receive an allowance equal to the average State unemployment insurance benefit, but this may be increased to the extent of $10 weekly. The length of training is normally a maximum of 1 year, but this can also be expanded—by up to 20 weeks for "basic language and number skills."

How is the Manpower Development and Training Act program going? At present, data are available for the August 1962 to December 1964 period, which is a relatively short time period for a full-scale appraisal. In numerical terms, about 350,000 people have been involved and about 70 percent of trainees in courses completed by mid-1964 had been placed in jobs within a few months after completing training. The majority of the employed trainees felt that their employment was training-related. The cost of their programs has been quite reasonable—by the end of 1964, development and training programs had cost about $300 million, which comes to somewhat less than $1,000 per trainee.

There are some shortcomings, but these may well be inescapable. As the last manpower report of the President pointed out, "youths under the age of 19 represented only half as many of the young trainees as of the young unemployed in 1963." This fact was due largely to restrictions of youth allowances; which had since been modified. Second, older workers are not being reached very effectively—workers 45 and over comprise somewhat more than 25 percent of the unemployed, but somewhat less than 10 percent of all Manpower Development and Training Act trainees. Third, the undereducated—less than 9 years of school—are about one-third of all unemployed persons, but about 15 percent of Manpower Development and Training Act trainees.

In addition to these participation problems, only 8 percent of all trainees were in on-the-job training programs, which seem to me to be vastly preferable to institutional training and all sorts of demonstration projects. Using but a single fact to support my assertion—"2 out of every 3 on-the-job training trainees were being prepared for skilled or semiskilled jobs, compared with less than half of those in institutional projects." We might note, in this connection, that the Federal Govenrment sponsored programs in vocational education—involving something over 4 million people—are really just the same thing as the manpower programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act institutionally sponsored training schemes. Why these two programs need to be run under different auspices is really beyond me.

The second major set of manpower programs involves the much publicized war on poverty, recently escalated to roughly twice its levels for the next fiscal year, consists of roughly 10 or 11 programs all of which have more or less relevance to the Federal Government' manpower policies. The largest—and by far the most controversial—is the community action program under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. During the last fiscal year, something in excess of $150 million was spent by this program. Despite the fact that this is the largest of the programs run by the Office of Economic Opportunity, its relation to manpower policy is hazy at best. In fact, although I spent 3 whole months in working on the poverty program, I am still not really sure about just what community action programs involve and what they hope to accomplish. This category certainly does cover a great variety of things: The Head Start program of preschool centers initiated last summer, consumer education of various kinds (ranging from information about interest costs and carrying charges on installment contracts to the price differentials between different merchandizers), legal services, political action efforts, and weight-control programs for the ladies. I see two major problems in this part of the poverty program—first, is any kind of action at all useful and second, just who is to be responsible.

In the former connection, it seems to me that we are just initiating action or actions of various and sundry kinds without having any idea of what they will accomplish—for example, in Syracuse, the school of social work was organizing rent strikes, marches on city hall, and the like, in direct opposition to the programs run by the city, one of the most progressive in the field of social welfare. In the latter connection, community action programs are allegedly administered in line with the so-called three-legged stool principle. Local governments, existing welfare agencies, and the "poor" themselves are supposed to be involved in the planning and the execution of these programs. As has been brought out time and time again, these programs have turned into "giant fiestas of political patronage," to use Representative Adam Clayton Powell's phrase, and the above-mentioned stool has one, two, or even all three of its legs missing and we wind up sitting squarely on the floor.

In addition to the community action program, which is to cost almost one-half of a billion dollars in the 1966 fiscal year, a number of other OEO programs may be characterized as supportive or even peripheral to our Federal Government's manpower policy. There are special programs of loans for those few farmers that have not already got them from the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture and a similar program of small loans for small businesses. In the education field, we have a beefing up of adult basic education programs, already in existence for a number of years almost everywhere; the work-study program for college students; and Project Head Start for preschool youngsters. There is aid for migrant agricultural workers; there is something called the foster grandparents program; there is VISTA; and there is something known as upward bound, although existing legislation gives us no clue as to what that might be.

In discussing manpower policy (in the sense that I have used the term), there are three major programs under OEO auspices. The largest of these, in terms of the number involved during the first year of operation, is the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, which served about 278,000 teenagers at a cost of $134 million. This program provides part-time work in "newly created jobs in nonprofit or municipal agencies" and pays at the rate of $1.25 per hour. We might mention that the decision to pay the national minimum wage is an administrative decision of the Department of Labor, which administers this program.

Second, again in terms of numbers, is the work experience program, usually for people on relief rolls. This program involved about 80,000 participants and its total cost was somewhat in excess of $100 million during the 1965 fiscal year. Administered by the Welfare Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, an example of this program is provided by a million-dollar grant to the Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare where about 1,000 men and women will receive "training in good work habits and attitudes * * * through beautification activity as nurserymen, gardeners, and truckdrivers" (hearings before subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, supplemental appropriation bill, 1966, p. 394).

However, by far the best known and the most controversial manpower program—run by the OEO itself, which fact may well be responsible for these two characteristics—is the Job Corps. As you know, the Job Corps provides remedial education and job training for out-of-school and out-of-work men and women between 16 and 21. About 40 residential centers were established during the 1965 fiscal year and the Job Corps had an enrollment of something under 10,000 at that time. These centers are both rural and urban—in fact, the law required that 40 percent of all enrollees be in something called the Youth Conservation Corps or rural centers. The total cost per participant has been substantial in the first year of operation—the average exceeds $8,000, since more than $80 million was spent in fiscal 1965. For its second year, the Job Corps plans to have about 50,000 participants and the budget request was about $300 million. Thus, the cost per enrollee is likely to decrease somewhat (to about $6,000), but Mr. Shriver has indicated that he does not expect it to fall much below $4,000 to $5,000.

In comparing the effectiveness of the two main programs—the Manpower Development and Training Act and the OEO—in terms of their manpower impact (as opposed to social, psychological, and political aspects), it seems to me that the benefits of the former exceed those of the latter, given the present level of costs. The Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the work experience program are seldom geared to particular manpower shortages and often provide no specific training. While it may be socially useful to take a Washington, D.C., youth off the streets and send him to the Catoctin or even the Tongue Point Job Corps Center in Oregon, teaching him to wield an axe may constitute a cruel hoax. It is also socially useful to teach him to get up in the morning to brush his teeth, and not to slurp soup, but at the cost of $8,000 per year?

Let me soften my criticism by admitting that it may well be too early to evaluate fully and fairly both of these programs. The Manpower Development and Training Act has been in operation for a bout 3 years and the war on poverty for a year—the one test with the most meaning would be to take a sizable group of graduates from both programs and to follow their employment and earning experience. At present, my vague comparison of benefits and costs suggests devoting more resources to the Manpower Development and Training Act, but more information is certainly necessary.

As a final topic, let me mention a few constructive alternatives in the field of manpower policy. In the 1965 Economic Report of the President, there is an interesting set of statistics regarding training taken by persons in the civilian labor force (table 17, p. 129). The majority of respondents to a survey undertaken by the Department of Labor indicated that they had learned their job skills by on-the-job training; the next largest response indicated "casual methods"; and formal training as well as those reporting needing no training showed the lowest response rates. The point is, of course, that on-the-job training is most important and, I suspect, most successful. Yet, the increases in overall labor productivity and labor skills are usually paid for by a single employer, though they benefit the society and the economy as a whole.

An attempt to recognize this fact is provided by the Human Investment Act of 1965, which was introduced but, unfortunately, not afforded the attention that it deserves, in the 1st session of the 89th Congress. This bill, S. 1130, was introduced in February 1965, by Senator Prouty and cosponsored by a number of other Republicans in the Senate. A reworded measure, H.R. 10934, was introduced in the House by Representative Thomas B. Curtis and 43 cosponsors in September 1965.

The Human Investment Act provides a 7-percent tax credit as an incentive for the employment and training of presently unemployed workers. The maximum amount of credit allowable would be $25,000 plus 25 percent of the taxpayer's tax liability in excess of $25,000. The expenditures that can be used for this credit include, among others, the wages of apprentices in registered programs; the wages of workers in on-the-job training under section 204 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; employee training expenses paid to colleges, business or trade schools (as well as accredited correspondence schools); and the wages and salaries of workers participating in cooperative education programs involving alternate periods of work and study.

A second major area of assistance to manpower development involves maximizing labor mobility and minimizing restrictions on hiring and firing. In the last few decades, the fixed costs and nonwage costs—most Government determined—of adding a new worker have increased greatly. Unemployment insurance contributions are based on a so-called experience rating, which actually works against workers receiving the necessary experience. Employer contributions to social insurance of other types also increase the cost of adding new workers as does the not inconsequential paperwork involved. The national minimum wage may well be a restrictive influence on the hiring of teenagers—although exemptions can be secured from the Department of Labor under the apprentice and trainee provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, employer reaction seems to have been less than enthusiastic in securing such permissions.

In this second connection, then, I would favor granting an exemption from minimum wages for marginal workers—let us say, those between 16 and 21 as well as those who have not had steady work for the last year or two. Also, I would propose granting a similar exemption for social insurance contributions by the employer, with the Federal Government making direct contributions to the trust funds involved for a specific period of time. To conclude, I would want to minimize the Federal Government's direct intervention in the manpower field—only after tax incentives and elimination of restrictions are shown as not doing the job adequately should we embark on programs of the Job Corps type.

Peace Offensive in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on December 24, 1965, the administration halted the bombing of North Vietnam and at the first of the year launched a concerted peace offensive. U.N. Ambassador Arthur Goldberg talked to Pope Paul VI; W. Averell Harriman went to Poland, Yugoslavia, and India; McGeorge Bundy met with the Prime Minister of Canada; and Vice President HUMPHREY, in the course of less than a week in the Far East, met with three presidents, an emperor, and a prime minister. And, on January 10, 1966, the White House admitted that the Government of North Vietnam accepted a secret letter from the U.S. Government during a meeting between an American official and a representative from Hanoi.

The bombings still have not been resumed and it is reported that the administration is under considerable pressure from abroad to extend the pause in these raids for several more weeks or even months. This is supposedly to give Hanoi more time for diplomatic maneuver.

An inordinately high percentage of non-Communist commentary on this peace offensive seems to be marked by great optimism. Perhaps it would be more accurate to call it wishful thinking. Hanoi's reactions to date have been negative, to say the least. Nhan Dan, the Hanoi daily newspaper, in a commentary on the President's state of the Union message, said, on January 16, 1966:

> Lying in the framework of the noisy peace campaign of the U.S. ruling circles and being one of its keynotes, Johnson's message was no different from the previous statements of the U.S. ruling circles; that is, in spite of its varied form, it remains a statement full of contradictions and smells strongly of colonialism and war. Facts have proved that each time the U.S. aggressors launched a noisy campaign about peaceful negotiations on the settlement of the Vietnam problem, they took a further step in the intensification of the war.

The analysts waxed hopeful again when the Vietcong announced they would observe a 4-day truce in the fighting over the religious and festive Vietnamese holiday of Tet, the lunar new year; 23 hours before this truce was to go into effect, a platoon of Vietcong guerillas massacred 33 civilians, wounded 54, and kidnaped 9 men in an attack on a South Vietnamese refugee camp, 350 miles north of Saigon. Men, women, and children were killed; the only explanation for this vicious and wanton murder seems to be that the Vietcong were taking revenge on refugees from a village that had been overrun by the Vietcong in November. Many of the villagers had fled to the refugee camp at Tu Hiep, where the massacre occurred.

In addition to this mass murder, after the cease-fire was supposedly in effect, the Vietcong made four attacks on outposts near Saigon and an assault on a village near Hue.

What the analysts who now speculate so hopefully on an eventual favorable response from Hanoi will make of this is hard to say. If the present peace offensive runs its course and the war is resumed, we can safely assume that the analysts will find some way to blame it all on the United States, for not allowing Hanoi more time for diplomatic maneuver.

Leaving aside the merits and the wisdom of the administration's peace offensive—some serious criticism has been leveled at its manner, timing, and method—I think it is appropriate to ask that familiar question that always comes up when any sort of attempted deal with the Communists goes sour: "After all, what more could we have expected?"

One of our most perceptive and competent journalists is Joseph Alsop. Two of his recent columns, one appearing in the Indianapolis News of January 5, 1966, entitled "Johnson Peace Offensive Ignores History's Lessons," and one appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of January 19, 1966, entitled "L.B.J. Meet Sun Tzu," will, I hope, go a long way toward bringing some people back to the grim realities of the Vietnamese situation.

In his January 5 column he exposed the naked, harsh truth of what negotiations mean to the Communists and stripped away the columns of hopeful prose that seem to have camouflaged the real issue:

> The Communist leaders, who are hardheaded men with a sound historical background, are fully aware of the central fact that the negotiation mongers always forget. No negotiation in history has ever done anything except register the hard facts of the situation being discussed at the time agreement was reached. And if negotiations are opened, while the pressure is remitted in Vietnam at this stage, the result is most unlikely to command the admiration of historians and even less likely to be admired by the American people.

On January 19, he invited the administration to become better acquainted with the writings of the Chinese military tactician Sun Tzu. The column begins:

> "When without a previous understanding the enemy asks for a truce, he is plotting." So runs the 28th proposition of the ninth chapter of Sun Tzu's "Art of War." On this proposition of the master's, the authoritative commentary was written by the worthy Ch'en Hao.

After discussing the influence Sun Tzu's writings—and Ch'en Hao's commentaries on them—have had on both Mao Tse-tung and the North Vietnamese Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, Mr. Alsop states:

> One can be quite certain, then, that proposition 28 of the ninth chapter and Ch'en Hao's commentary have been solemnly quoted 50 times a day by policymakers in Hanoi, ever since the Johnson peace offensive began.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that Mr. Alsop has stated the exact case. Let us look at a few more of Sun Tzu's maxims; some of them could be used as lead paragraphs for many stories coming out of Vietnam today:

> All warfare is based on deception * * * when we are near, we must make the enemy believe that we are away; when far away, we must make him believe we are near.

A recent major operation in what was believed to be heavily infested enemy territory found few Vietcong.

> Attack where he is unprepared, appear where you are not expected.

In Saigon, crowded restaurants are bombed and the American Embassy there is probably the most heavily guarded structure in all southeast Asia.

> Military tactics are like unto water, for water in its natural course runs away from high places and hastens downwards. So in war, the way to avoid what is strong is to strike the weak.

The New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1966, reporting on the massacre of the refugees at Tu Hiep just before the Vietcong truce, said:

> Survivors said one Vietnamese mother got down on her knees to beg for her baby's life, but a Red guerrilla shot her in the face and riddled the baby with submachine-gun bullets.

What Arthur Goldberg said to Pope Paul VI, what Averell Harriman said to Tito, what Vice President HUMPHREY said to the Prime Minister of Japan and the contents of that mysterious letter from the U.S. Government to Hanoi have probably had just the opposite effect of what was intended. Instead, as Mr. Alsop points out, the peace offensive has very likely provided Hanoi with "arguments to persuade doubters within the North Vietnamese politburo that American weakness of will and lack of resolution can still be counted on to bring victory in the end."

I hope Mr. Alsop's articles receive the careful study they deserve:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) News, Jan. 5, 1966]

JOHNSON PEACE OFFENSIVE IGNORES HISTORY'S LESSONS

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—Behind the current turmoil there is a central fact. Without much reference to the opinions of his advisers, President Johnson has been carrying on a personal peace offensive.

Orders have gone out to U.S. diplomats overseas. High officials have been phoned from the ranch. This man has been sent to see Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin. That one—Gov. W. Averell Harriman, as it turns out—has been hurried off to Warsaw with a message for the Poles. All have been commanded to pass the word that the President is a man of peace who longs above anything for peace in Vietnam.

One consequence, obviously, is the visit to Hanoi of the Soviet delegation headed by Alexander Shelepin. It has officially been denied that this visit was concerted by the Soviet and U.S. Governments; but if this denial is not an outright lie it is at least rather gravely misleading.

For one of the prime aims, if not the sole aim, of the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam was clearly to promote such a Soviet visit by opening the way for it. The message conveyed to Ambassador Dobrynin was clearly, "Now's the time, and make the best of it." The Soviets have clearly been assured that bombing will not be resumed while Shelepin is in the North Vietnamese capital. And Shelepin's mission is clearly to urge the Hanoi leaders to seize the opportunity to go to the negotiating table.

The pall of official secrecy is total. But a child of 3 can see that the foregoing must be hard statements of fact, unless the American Government or the Soviet Government, or both, have reached a stage of near-lunatic imprudence.

Meanwhile, from Hanoi at this writing, there have been only two signs of response. A New Year's truce was offered the South Vietnamese—like the truce last year that ended with the attack on the American barracks at Pleiku. And Hanoi radio has loudly praised the aid given North Vietnam by Communist China, including the promise of large numbers of "volunteers."

Beyond much doubt, the Chinese Communist leaders are exultantly informing the North Vietnamese leaders that this Johnson peace offensive proves once again the eternal rightness of the formula of Mao Tse-tung that "America is a paper tiger." Equally beyond doubt, the North Vietnamese may easily be persuaded by the Chinese argument.

As they have said quite openly, the Hanoi leaders have always built their hope of victory in South Vietnam on their apparently sincere conviction that the Americans, being soft, self-indulgent and lacking in serious resolution, will eventually get tired of fighting in South Vietnam and quietly go away. Short of actually ordering the troops to begin embarking, it would be hard to find a more likely way to bolster this North Vietnamese conviction than the peace offensive that is now going on.

Yet there can be little question that the Shelepin mission will expose the Hanoi leadership to considerable, although probably unspoken pressure. When someone says, "Seize this opportunity," it is not necessary to add the warning, "There may not be another." Thus, the outcome at present is quite unpredictable.

A provisional prediction can be offered with complete confidence, however. If President Johnson's peace offensive does in fact lead to negotiations at this time, it will not be remembered with much admiration by historians of the future.

The word "unconditional" was originally inserted in the President's offer of "unconditional negotiations" because the lesson of Korea was at that time well remembered by the President and his advisers. They were, therefore, ready to talk—as they ought to have been, ought to be now—but they were not ready to have preconditions imposed that would have weakened or ended the pressure on the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

The Johnson peace offensive has created circumstances, however, in which keeping the negotiations unconditional will be almost impossible if they begin now. After what has passed already, woolly people in this country and around the world will surely give way to total hysteria if the United States merely does what is obviously rational and in full accord with recent harsh lessons—keeping the pressure up until a reasonable and acceptable peace has been agreed upon.

The Communist leaders, who are hardheaded men with a sound historical background, are fully aware of the central fact that the negotiation-mongers always forget. No negotiation in history has ever done anything except register the hard facts of the situation being discussed at the time agreement was reached.

And if negotiations are opened, while the pressure is remitted in Vietnam at this stage, the result is most unlikely to command the admiration of historians and even less likely to be admired by the American people.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Tribune, Jan. 19, 1966]

L.B.J., MEET SUN TZU

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—"When without a previous understanding the enemy asks for a truce, he is plotting."

So runs the 28th proposition of the 9th chapter of Sun Tzu's "Art of War." On this proposition of the master's, the authoritative commentary was written by the worthy Ch'en Hao.

"If without reason one begs for a truce it is assuredly because affairs in his country are in a dangerous state and he is worried and wishes to make a plan to gain a respite. Or otherwise he knows that our situation is susceptible to his plots and wants to forestall our suspicions by asking for a truce. Then he will take advantage."

These words, here given in the admirable translation of the scholarly American marine, Gen. Samuel B. Griffith, are of almost measureless antiquity by American standards. Sun Tzu himself appears to have been a Chinese general of the early period of the warring states, which means that his probable date was in the neighborhood of 350 B.C.

As for Ch'en Hao, he stands about midway in the long succession of important commentators on Sun Tzu; he flourished during the T'ang dynasty, rather more than a millennium ago. Yet in this season of Lyndon Johnson's noisy peace offensive, Sun Tzu's proposition and Ch'en Hao's commentary are of very great current importance.

For Sun Tzu is the Clausewitz of the Far East (and far more brilliant and perceptive, as well as miraculously less verbose than the wordy German theorist of war). And Sun Tzu's "Art of War" was the unique foundation of Mao Tse-tung's theory and practice of guerrilla warfare, and of the development of Mao by the masterly North Vietnamese Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap.

In both the Chinese Communist and North Vietnamese staff schools, students therefore quite often learn by rote both the basic text and the main commentaries of Sun Tzu. One can be quite certain, then, that proposition 28 of the ninth chapter and Ch'en Hao's commentary have been solemnly quoted 50 times a day by policymakers in Hanoi, ever since the Johnson peace offensive began.

It will seem very odd indeed to the countless American authorities on Asia who have never studied Asian history or set foot on Asian soil, yet the deadly seeming appositeness of Sun Tzu and Ch'en Hao may be assumed to have impressed the North Vietnamese Government a lot more than such richly comic gestures as sending Arthur Goldberg to talk the ear off the poor Pope.

The betting is increasingly heavy, to be sure, that the prime motive of the President's peace offensive was the domestic politics, as astutely defined by Ch'en Hao. Furthermore, since negotiations are obviously undesirable at this time, the almost viciously negative North Vietnamese response to date should be a matter of deep relief.

But before the jet-propelled takeoff of another international diplomatic fuss of this type, a little more consideraion really ought to be given to the character of the intended audience. In the present case, there were several other things to consider besides the characteristic modes of thought and standards of judgment of the North Vietnamese and Chinese Communists.

There was, to begin with, the enormity of the price of a prolonged pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. Bombing attacks on lines of communications are not the most damaging possible kind of attack on North Vietnam; but the American pilots, who have risked and sometimes lost their lives in these attacks, have nonetheless done a brilliant job.

Before the pause, repairs of roads and rail lines had caused such an acute manpower shortage that only women were left to till the fields in a good many provinces. Very young girls were being mobilized as road-coolies. Interprovincial communications were already breaking down.

In other words, the pressure, although not of the most severe sort, was already beginning to produce quite crippling effects. The prolonged pause has therefore acted as a heaven-sent breathing spell, permitting all serious damage to be put right again. And thus the fact should be faced, it has probably helped to prolong the war.

Then, too, the internal political situation in Hanoi deserved some consideration. Briefly, failing health has almost certainly reduced Ho Chi Minh to a figurehead. The real power is in the hands of the secretary of the Communist Party, Le Duan. And Le Duan not merely made his party reputation by criticizing the decision to negotiate with the French in 1954; he was also the original organizer, and he is still the principal director, of the "war of liberation" in South Vietnam.

Le Duan's personal situation, therefore, will always compel this man to reject negotiation, except under irresistible duress or with an abject promised surrender as bait. A peace offensive and a longed-for respite from bombing are not duress. Instead they have no doubt given Le Duan exactly what he wanted most—arguments to persuade doubters within the North Vietnamese politburo that American weakness of will and lack of resolution can still be counted on to bring victory in the end.

Support of U.S. Policy in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district there is a group of young men who have banded themselves together into an organization dedicated to honor, friendship, and justice in service to their community and to numerous charitable activities. This organization, known as Sigma Beta Alpha, was founded in 1954.

Added to the fine record of the club is the fact that they recently gained new luster to their civic activities when their membership passed a resolution that stated very simply, "As members of Sigma Beta Alpha we place our names with honor in support of our Government's policy in Vietnam." The covering letter which forwarded this resolution to me said that "being sensible young men we dislike war, but we feel the fight in Vietnam is not a war but a fight for freedom. We support our Government's policy and are grateful to the men who are fighting and dying for peace."

I firmly believe that the action of Sigma Beta Alpha is representative of the thinking of thousands of men and women throughout our country who firmly support our President and our Nation in those efforts to confine Communist aggression in southeast Asia. I am very pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the men who signed the resolution referred to above:

As members of Sigma Beta Alpha, we place our names with honor in support of our Government's policy in Vietnam.

Salvador Vic Huerta, Robert L. Martinez, Robert R. Kuck, Tom Mattsson, Jerrie Powers, Ron Stone, Gene Andrews, Thomas M. Rivas, Wayne Bollan, Theodore John Moes.

Thomas Alan Peddecord, Stan Giorgi, Ronald Caviglia, Roger Hall, Maitland E. Elderts, Rich Redman, Steve Larson, Alan R. Baitinger, Steve Ojeda, Bruce Lee.

Tony Martinelli, Stephen Powers, Rich Redman, John Kuck, Robert A. McAuliff, Jr., Bill Thomas, Don Carmody, Bob Tatum, Steven V. Giorgi.

WTOP Speaks Out Against "Foolish Loyalty Oath"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this session of Congress, I introduced a bill (H.R. 11922) that would strike out of the medicare bill those provisions upon which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has relied to require the filing of a disclaimer by some 2 million persons who will be enrolling in the medicare program but who are not covered by social security, railroad retirement or civil service.

I believe that the required filing of this disclaimer is an infringement of the rights of free Americans and have urged the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to eliminate it. If he fails to do so, I believe that Congress should act promptly. Many senior citizens have refused to file for medicare benefits because of this indignity. The deadline is March 31.

I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which was aired over station WTOP radio and television here in Washington on January 18 and January 19. I commend WTOP for its forthright stand.

The text of the editorial follows:

This is a WTOP editorial.

Never underestimate the ability of government to go dashing down strange, unproductive bypaths.

Take, as an example, that ridiculous business of compelling about 2 million old persons to sign a kind of loyalty oath as a condition for receiving medicare benefits.

These 2 million men and women will receive medicare benefits from the general Federal tax revenues. To do so they must make formal application. The present application form, prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, contains the following question: "Are you now, or have you been during the last 12 months, a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action, a Communist-front, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?" Answer "yes" or "no."

HEW spokesmen, who are understandably embarrassed by all this, explain that the loyalty provision is required by an obscure section of law which is too tedious for us to go into. What is really involved is the dogged belief of some legislators and bureaucrats that they can prevent treachery by requiring everyone to affirm his loyalty. It's a kind of ritual conducted with little regard for logic.

Let us say this about affirmative loyalty oaths: except in very rare instances, they are of absolutely no use to anyone. The patriot is insulted to have to testify to his own trustworthiness. The subversive would not hesitate to lie about his connections. All the affirmative loyalty oaths administered in recent years are nothing more than a pile of paper junk awaiting appropriate disposal—by burning or by burying.

Congresman WILLIAM RYAN, of New York, has introduced a bill to remove the Communist disclaimer from the medicare application. That legislation should be whooped through, so that all elderly persons may receive medicare payments without being subjected to a loyalty inquisition.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Leading Educator, Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, Warns That "Independent" Fed Limits Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, many important voices are being raised against the Federal Reserve Board's unwarranted action of December 3, 1965, which imposed another round of high interest costs on the country. Among these is the distinguished and highly respected educator Robert M. Hutchins, former chancellor of the University of Chicago who is now head of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. His remarks appeared in a recent issue of the Los Angeles Times, entitled "Another Look at Interest Rates." His column follows:

ANOTHER LOOK AT INTEREST RATES

(By Robert M. Hutchins)

Three courses, I have suggested, are open to the country if it wants to prevent the economy from overheating as a result of the war in Vietnam.

The first is to stop the war. The second is to raise taxes. The third is to increase interest rates by the action of the Federal Reserve.

If it is impossible to stop the war, the equitable and democratic procedure is to raise taxes. This can be done only by the elected representatives of the people. It can be done with a view to the just distribution of burdens. The rate and incidence of taxation can be made a matter of intense public debate.

Nothing of this sort applies to the increase of interest rates by the Federal Reserve. The board is not responsible to the people. It is not elected by them. No President can be sure it will follow the policies of the Government; and it may make the execution of those policies impossible. It may prevent the adoption of an integrated economic program. It may disregard public discussion of fiscal problems and public criticism of its decision.

Yet these decisions are vital to the well-being of the people. To deny the representatives of the people a voice in them is to limit the scope of democracy.

The only certain beneficiaries of an increase in interest rates are the banks. They benefit by a higher price for what they have to sell. The losers are those who need what the banks have to sell, those who need money to build something, to develop something, or simply to live.

It must be more than a coincidence that on one day it was announced that construction permits had taken the severest downturn in 10 months and on the next Standard & Poor's predicted an average increase of 6 percent in the earnings of major banks.

No doubt there may be times at which a country will have to raise interest rates and taxes simultaneously. This may be one. The representatives of the people should decide. But in any case the agency fixing interest rates should be in fact a part of the Government and not a paragovernmental, nonresponsible group of experts.

All this seems clear enough, so clear that the bankers who have attacked me for saying it have not cared to argue these points. They have contented themselves with claiming that the Federal Reserve System has worked very well, forgetting that in 1933 it stopped working altogether. They say it has generated prosperity, a perfect example of the Chanticleer fallacy—the rooster believes the sun rises because he crows.

My friend Louis Lancaster, of the Santa Barbara National Bank, says of the Federal Reserve, "It has produced enough surplus wealth to relieve Mr. Hutchins of working with pick and shovel."

Two hundred years ago, long before the Federal Reserve was invented, Penuel Hutchins left the ancestral farm in Connecticut and became a doctor. Ever since that time his descendants have lived by their wits.

After the Federal Reserve was established, my Uncle Grosvenor became a banker. We were very polite to him: he was the most prosperous member of the family.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's message recommending changes in House Members' terms and in electoral college.

Senate cleared three sundry bills for White House and passed D.C. minimum wage law revisions.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 657–700

Bills Introduced: 14 bills and 17 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2795–2808; S.J. Res. 126; and S. Res. 188–203.

Pages 660–662

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 7723, to suspend the duty on certain tropical hardwoods, with amendments (S. Rept. 949);

H.R. 7813, to authorize loan of Naval vessels to friendly foreign countries, with amendments (S. Rept. 950); and

The following 14 original resolutions from the Committee on the Judiciary authorizing funds for operations for that committee and its subcommittees were reported without written report and were referred to Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 190—Administrative Practice and Procedure	$175,000.00
S. Res. 191—Antitrust and Monopoly	561,700.00
S. Res. 192—Charters and Holidays	7,500.00
S. Res. 193—Constitutional Amendments	117,685.15
S. Res. 194—Constitutional Rights	195,000.00
S. Res. 195—Criminal Laws and Procedures	120,000.00
S. Res. 196—Immigration and Naturalization	170,000.00
S. Res. 197—Internal Security	431,000.00
S. Res. 198—Improvements in Judicial Machinery	184,020.00
S. Res. 199—Juvenile Delinquency	260,000.00
S. Res. 200—National Penitentiaries	5,000.00
S. Res. 201—Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights	110,000.00
S. Res. 202—Refugees and Escapees	105,400.00
S. Res. 203—Revision and Codification	42,500.00

Pages 658–660

President's Message—Term of House Members: President transmitted message with his recommendations for adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to increase from 2 years to 4 years the term of Members of the House of Representatives and to revise the electoral college—referred to Committee on the Judiciary.

Pages 655–657

Rio Grande Bridge: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 10779, authorizing construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Pharr, Tex., agreed to conference requested by House, and appointed as conferees Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Morse, Hickenlooper, and Aiken.

Page 672

D.C. Minimum Wage: By 60 yeas to 10 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendment H.R. 8126, to broaden the coverage of D.C. minimum wage laws, after adopting committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute) as to which the following actions on amendments had first been taken:

Adopted: Modified Prouty amendment to remove from the bill certain recordkeeping requirements and all posting requirements and criminal penalties with respect to employers of domestic servants in private residences; and Prouty amendment redefining the term "wage" for purpose of the legislation and specifying what shall be included in ad hoc advisory committee reports on revision of wage orders; and

Rejected: By 28 yeas to 42 nays, Prouty (for Dominick) amendment to eliminate power of D.C. Commissioners to raise arbitrarily the minimum wage above the statutory limits in the proposed legislation.

Senate insisted on its amendments, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Bible, Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Pages 700–717

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that it is the intention on Monday, January 24, at the conclusion of the morning hour to move to take up H.R. 77, right-to-work repeal.

Page 718

Bills Cleared for President: Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President the following three Finance Committee bills:

Building and Loan Associations: H.R. 327, exempting from taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations operated to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations;

Appendix

Hawaiian Contribution to Protectorate of Democracy: U.S.S. "Kamehameha" (SSBN 642)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 16 last, the Mare Island division of the newly formed San Francisco Bay Shipyard commissioned the U.S.S. *Kamehameha* as the 32d U.S.—SSBN—Polaris nuclear submarine. We honored in the West a year ago when we launched this great Hawaiian namesaked submarine many congressional leaders from Hawaii and California gathered for the occasion.

We are proud of our workmanship at Mare Island and particularly this great new instrument in our protectorate of democracy.

Adm. Hyman Rickover points up more particularly this matter as follows:

U.S.S. "Kamehameha" (SSBN 642),
Fleet Post Office,
San Francisco, Calif., November 1, 1965.

Hon. Robert L. Leggett,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Leggett: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Kamehameha,* our 32d Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 54. The *Kamehameha* was built at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.

This ship is named for a man who was neither by birth nor choice American, who knew little about America, had few close contacts with Americans and never set foot on American soil. Scion of a royal family, he belonged to an alien race and religion. His political preference was for Britain, not for the United States. He was Kamehameha, King of Hawaii from 1810 to 1819.

If it seems strange that the name of a Hawaiian king should be borne by an American warship, the paradox resolves itself when we remember that he was the most striking figure in Hawaiian history and Hawaii is now our 50th State. We honor his memory because in our philosophy the heritage of every State of the Union is part of our common heritage. There is room in the pantheon of America's great for the heroes of every sector of this vast Nation.

Kamehameha was a great warrior. Having fallen heir in 1782 to a small chieftaincy, he set out to conquer all the islands. Others had tried before but he was the first to succeed. It took 28 years before all resistance was quelled, but the bitter fratricidal fight brought an end to the continuous interisland wars that mar so much of Hawaian history.

Kamehameha proved himself an extraordinarily able and wise ruler. His power was absolute but he used it benevolently. Under him the people were assured of justice and domestic peace. It was said of Hawaii under Kamehameha—as of Saxon England under King Alfred—that along any highway a child, woman, or old man could lie down to sleep in perfect safety.

At whatever time he had lived, Kamehameha would have deserved to be called the great, but his achievements were enhanced by the fact that they occurred at a time when Hawaii needed as never before to be united and well governed. His adult life coincided with the dangerous and difficult period that followed Captain Cook's discovery of the islands in 1778, when trading ships from Europe and America in ever-growing numbers made the islands their way station for rest and revictualing.

The visiting seamen brought weapons and tools that aroused the admiration of the Hawaiians, but also new vices and diseases that decimated their number. The rowdy behavior of the visitors was a constant threat to the independence of the islands, for any incident brought with it the danger of foreign intervention. By maintaining public order and treating foreigners with scrupulous honesty and cordial hospitality, Kamehameha gained his people almost a century of political freedom.

After a thousand years of self-contained remoteness, the Hawaiians were ill prepared to cope with the sudden influx of strange new ideas and ways of life. An indigenous Stone Age culture, no matter how highly developed, rarely survives contact with modernity. Kamehameha, who had grown up in old Hawaii, cherished its ancient religion and customs but realized his people must master modern techniques. He had an eye for what was good and what was bad in foreign ways. Against the latter he sought to protect his people, while enlisting the help and friendship of several foreigners in order to acquire such technology as would be useful for Hawaii. He deserves much of the credit for easing the transition from an old to a new culture, and for whatever remains today of the spirit of old Hawaii and its attractive way of life.

It is fitting that one of our swift new nuclear submarines should bear the name of this illustrious son of a race of intrepid seafarers whose swift canoes made landfall with amazing accuracy across the wide spaces of the Pacific, whose superb seamanship and knowledge of stars, winds, and currents still arouse wonder and admiration.

Respectfully,

H. G. Rickover.

Constantino Brumidi—The Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on January 17, I introduced legislation to honor Constantino Brumidi, Capitol artist who labored from 1855 to 1880 to grace our walls with his artistic genius.

The nationwide appreciation of the work of this man is most gratifying and a source of immense pride, a pride reflected in this article by Mr. Anthony Cama of Lynn, Mass., commissioner of Italian culture for the Order of the Sons of Italy. I am honored to share it with my colleagues by placing it at this point in the appendix of the Congressional Record:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI—THE "MICHELANGELO OF THE U. S. CAPITOL"

(By Anthony Cama)

It was truly a great pleasure not so long ago for this writer to have a most pleasant correspondence with Lt. Gov. Elliot Richardson, who, besides his many other statesmanship qualities, has a great love of art. One of his unforgettable experiences is coming to know and love the beautiful paintings and murals of Constantino Brumidi which adorn with grace and Italian glory the U.S. Capitol. This article is the promise kept between Lieutenant Governor Richardson and the writer, Cama. We also have discovered another lover of Brumidi's art, Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois, who will introduce legislation to have a bust of Brumidi placed in the U.S. Capitol.

This writing, therefore, is a cry to all lovers of art, to all Italo-Americans, and, especially, members of the Order of the Sons of Italy in America, to sit down and write cards and letters to Senator Douglas to help him in this worthy crusade. A portion of this superb story is hereby presented to the readers of the Lynn Sunday Post.

Senator Douglas noted Brumidi's genius has thrilled millions of the visitors to the Capitol who have walked its spacious halls and historic rooms and viewed the beauty of its painted walls, particularly in the Senate corridor, appropriately titled the "Brumidi Corridor," the corridor in which Senator Douglas' office is located.

Constantino Brumidi, often termed the "Michelangelo of the U.S. Capitol," was born in Rome, Italy, July 26, 1805, and was one of the three Roman artists in his native Italy commissioned to restore Raphael frescoes in the Vatican loggia in Vatican City. He was exiled to America because of political activities in 1852 and was hired by Capt. Montogomery C. Meigs, to decorate the Agriculture Committee room at the Capitol in 1855. After he was commissioned, Brumidi remarked, "No longer have I any desire for fame and fortune. My one ambition and my daily prayer is that I may live long enough to make beautiful the Capitol of the one country on earth in which there is liberty." His brush was very busy in succeeding years, and the Nation's Capitol was his canvas. His work included the Senate extension, the Senate floor corridors, the House of Representative Chamber, the House of Representatives committee room, the Capitol rotunda, containing his magnificent frescoes frieze of 15 historical groupings and capped by his huge frescoed canopy in the eye of the Capitol dome, measuring some 4,664 square feet of concave fresco. His work flourished until his tragic fall while working on the rotunda frieze terminated his labors. He died in 1880, and was buried in an unmarked grave in Washington's Glenwood Cemetery, and it took 72 years for a grateful nation to acknowledge its debt to this man. Led by the persistence of Dr. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of then Congressman Murdock, Democrat, of Arizona, Congress authorized a bronze marker for Brumidi's grave in Glenwood Cemetery.

Senator Douglas noted that some 86 years have passed since Constantino Brumidi completed his final act of love in gracing the walls of the most important citadel of freedom in the world, the U.S. Capitol, and not a single bust or statue of him is to be found in our Capitol. It is certainly the least we can do for a man who signed his work with pride as "C. Brumidi, Artist, Citizen of the United States."

So, today, for over 100 years, the splendor of Italian art so masterfully executed by Brumidi reflects the dignity, the permanence of our Capitol, and the greatness of our beloved United States of America.

Two Columns by Arthur Hoppe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Satirist Arthur Hoppe has written two columns in which I am sure his fans will be interested. One, published in the San Francisco Chronicle on January 13, is entitled "Private Drab Contemplates War" and the other column entitled "Now It's Time for Show and Tell" appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle on January 19. His columns follow:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, *Jan. 13, 1966*]

Our Man Hoppe: Private Drab Contemplates War

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"Do you think," said Pvt. Oliver Drab, 378-18-4454, scrunching lower in his foxhole as the sniper fire whistled overhead, "that we ought to declare war on those fellows out there?"

"Who says we should?" asked his buddy, Corporal Partz, tugging his helmet down as far as it would go.

"Some of the experts back in Washington and please take your foot out of my face," said Private Drab. "They say as long as we're shooting them up and bombing them, declaring war is the honorable thing to do. And then we could hang all the demonstrators back home as traitors."

"I don't like civilians either," said Corporal Partz. "But if we're not fighting a war, what are we fighting?"

"Why," said Private Drab with some surprise, "I'm darned if I know. I'll go ask the captain."

So when there was a lull, Private Drab crawled to the command post, lifted his neck, saluted and asked Captain Buck Ace respectfully: "Excuse me, sir. But why are we here?"

"Dammit, Drab," snapped the captain, "are you starting that again?"

"Oh, no sir, it's that me and the corporal were a little confused about what we're fighting for."

The captain clapped the private on the shoulder in fatherly fashion. "The manual says a soldier fights better if he knows what he's fighting for, Drab. So just keep in mind that you're fighting to honor our commitments and to preserve our national integrity. That's why you're in this war, soldier."

"Oh. But we're not at war, are we sir?'

"Not technically," conceded the captain, twirling his bushy mustache. "Technically, we are providing aid and military advice to our loyal allies who are engaged in civil strife."

Just then, a mortar shell exploded nearby. "Keep your fool heads down or you'll get killed," cried Private Drab. "Excuse me, sir," he added. "I was providing military advice to our loyal allies."

"No need, Drab," said the captain. "We don't have any loyal allies with us on this operation. You see, it's a surprise attack and we don't trust them."

"Yes, sir," said the private, frowning.

"Anyway, soldier,' said the captain, patting him on the back, "I guess you know now why you're here."

"Yes, sir," said Private Drab thoughtfully. "I guess it was mainly because I was drafted."

"With peacetime soldiers like you, Drab," said the captain exasperatedly, "I don't know how we'll ever win this * * * this * * * Dammit, Drab. Get back to your foxhole or I'll shoot you myself."

"What'd he say?" inquired Corporal Partz as Private Drab flopped back into the foxhole half a second ahead of a machinegun burst. "Do you think we ought to declare war?"

"Nope," said Private Drab, spitting out a mouthful of dirt "To tell the truth, I think we've got enough troubles already without having a war on our hands."

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Jan. 19, 1966]

Our Man Hoppe: Now It's Time for Show and Tell

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"I'm mighty glad to see all you fellows home again. And I'm right proud of the way you went flying all over the world in 68 different directions in search of peace. And now it's time for Show and Tell. You first, Hubert."

"Yes, sir. And let me say, sir, I was pleased as punch you sent me to India for the funeral. I mean it dispelled a lot of vicious rumors that there was some reason you didn't wish me to represent you on these grim and sorrowful occasions."

"Stop smiling, Hubert."

"Yes, sir. Honest, I didn't smile once over there. And I had this great peace talk for hours and hours in New Delhi with Premier Kosygin, who was there, too. See? Here are my press clippings. They say it was the longest conference in years between us and them."

"And what did Kosygin say, Hubert?"

"Well, here's the 248-page transcript of our conversation, sir. You'll find his remarks on the very last page. See? Where he says, 'Nyet.' "

"That's fine, Hubert. I'm sure my sending you over there convinced everybody I'm a peace-loving man. And quiet-loving, too. Now what about you—ah * * * What's your name? Dean?"

"Sorry, sir, my name tag slipped. But Averell and I had a fine trip. As you know we were the only ones to visit Vietnam. And I'd like to show the agreement we hammered out over there."

"With the Vietcong, Dean? You been talking to them?"

"Oh, no, sir. Not on your life. The agreement's with our ally, Premier Ky. See? We promise to go right on sending him troops and money. And he promises to go right on accepting them."

"I never lost hope that one of you fellows would bring home an agreement. And such a lasting one, too. That's mighty fine, Dean. Now it's your turn, McGeorge. And stop scowling."

"Frankly, sir, I was a little hurt that you'd only send me far as Ottawa in search of peace. Think how I feel at Georgetown cocktail parties when people say, 'Hi, there, McGeorge, and where have you been lately?' When I mumble, 'Ottawa,' they arch their eyebrows and go off to talk to Joe Alsop."

"Trouble with you, McGeorge, is you haven't got your heart in your work any more. Look at Soapy, here. He goes all through Africa in search of peace and this time he doesn't get punched in the nose once. Or Arthur, here. You know what he found out in Rome? He found out the Pope's in favor of peace, too. Headlines everywhere. Yet, thanks to all these fine fellows flying millions of miles everybody now knows I'm a peace-loving man. What a tremendous success. What a strategic triumph. What a blow for peace."

"But, sir, we don't seem any closer to peace than before."

"Nonsense, Dean. Seeing it's my turn, let me show my latest private poll. Look at that. I'm up 12 points. Yep, due to the greatest peace offensive the world ever saw, I'm going to get a little peace at last."

"In Vietnam, sir?"

"Vietnam. Nope, I mean where I need it most. Here at home. And now that Show and Tell is over, it's game-playing time. Robert, get out the board and the dice and we'll have another round of Risk."

Men of the Year Awards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Men of the Year Awards," from the January 1966 issue of Progressive Farmer, honoring Dr. Aubrey J. Brown, of Kentucky, and Mr. Jesse Safley, of Tennessee, be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Men of the Year Awards

Dr. Aubrey J. Brown, chairman of the department of agricultural economics, University of Kentucky, has won the respect of farmers and fellow workers. His service to Kentucky farmers in the fields of marketing, farm management, and agricultural policy has brought him national recognition. He is a member of the National Tobacco Industry Advisory Committee and a member of the agricultural committee of the American Bankers Association.

He and his staff are continuously helping farmers and farm organizations with management and marketing problems. In 1961, he played a major role in organizing and developing Kentucky's first farm analysis group. Each member of the Ohio Valley farm analysis group pays an annual fee, and, in return, an area farm management specialist assists him in summarizing records and making future plans. This service was extended to 75 farmers in the Bluegrass area last year. Now Dr. Brown and other University of Kentucky workers are preparing to extend this service to interested farmers near Louisville and Bowling Green.

Burley tobacco growers have profited many times from Dr. Brown's studies and research. In 1956, he studied the markets for burley in Spain and later a similar study was made in Egypt. Both studies paved the way for greater burley export sales. He also provided manpower to study the operations of tobacco warehouses to help bring about a more efficient marketing plan for Kentucky's main cash crop.

During the past 6 years, he and his staff members have held farm management schools in 30 counties. More than 1,200 farmers attended these sessions. He also had a series of schools for tax consultants who file returns for farmers.

Dr. Brown is the founder of Kentucky Farm Economics, a biweekly newsletter. The publication carries current information on outlook, marketing, agricultural policy, and farm management to 500 farmers and businesses. Dr. Brown also serves on the editorial board of the Agricultural Policy Review, a regional publication.

Cooperating with members of the University of Kentucky Animal Science Department, Dr. Brown has made market studies for feeder calf and feeder pig associations. And he helped with the reorganization of the Louisville Fruit and Vegetable Market.

Dr. Brown and his staff have rendered valuable service to Kentucky's future agriculture. Their studies and projections were used when Gov. Edward Breathitt launched his program to help farmers obtain a $1 billion annual income.

It is for these deeds and services, plus many others, that the Progressive Farmer names Dr. Aubrey J. Brown as 1965 Man of the Year for outstanding and loyal service to Kentucky's agriculture and its rural families.

The City of East Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government's war on poverty has long been needed. However, the efforts of the Government are not intended to and cannot replace the charitable efforts of individuals and private organizations. The two attacks—by Government and by private endeavor—must complement one another.

The city of East Point, in my congressional district, deserves special recognition of the manner in which it serves its people. This is accomplished through fine community pride and the concern of civic organizations of the city.

One example of the successful work of the civic organizations is the Tri Cities and Forest Park Clothing Bank, begun on Christmas Eve 1959 by the East Point Moose Lodge. From small quarters in a building on Main Street, the project has grown to occupy new quarters at 1949 Grove Avenue, East Point. This new building and land, valued at $27,000, was built through the donation of money, material, and labor by individuals, business firms, and civic organizations. The mortgage on this property will be burnt on February 3, thanks to the dedicated efforts of Ed Crumley and his associates.

Over 500 children in South Fulton and Clayton County receive their clothing free of charge from the bank. Volunteer women sort clothes and serve families on Saturdays. As a result of the success of this activity, 27 clothing banks have been established and are thriving throughout the State.

The Lay Committee of the East Point Health Council is a civic advisory board which supervises all welfare work in the city of East Point. It raises funds and provides assistance in necessary charity cases. It works with health nurses in administering all sorts of services to the poor, sick, and needy citizens, financed by allocations from the city and from individual contributions.

J. Lester Holt, chaplain of the city of East Point, is a dedicated servant of his community. The freezer locker and storehouse of food in his office is a source of needed assistance in family emergencies, and in 1965 he was responsible for 106 families receiving food, he counseled with 78 individuals, and visited 227 newcomers to East Point. In recognition of his tireless work in charitable causes, Chaplain Holt was chosen as "Mr. East Point" by the East Point Moose Lodge several years ago.

The city of East Point can take great pride and satisfaction in its accomplishments, which have earned for it a wide reputation as an energetic and civic-minded community.

Agriculture With Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which, since its organization in 1901 has been dedicated to the development of our water resources, has proposed that a study be made of the food and fiber which could be grown in saline waters. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the very provacative editorial which appeared in the November issue of the Monthly Reporter: "Agriculture With Sea Water."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Agriculture With Sea Water

The noticeable crescendo in legislation and technology with respect to an adequate supply of suitable water for the various needs of our future population prompts us to reprint here our editorial published nearly 2 years ago under the title "The Future of Agriculture."

In doing so now, we go a step further and suggest that we should broaden our research beyond attempting to make "fresh" water out of sea water, and explore thoroughly the possibility of breeding agricultural plants that can thrive in sea water itself. Nature has long since transmuted plant life in the sea to plant life on land. Possibly, with some help, she can reverse the process.

"It started when one of our directors, a farmer in a big way and reputedly the largest individual cotton grower in the world, asked us—'Why attempt the mass desalinization of sea water instead of adding something to it to make it suitable for plant growth?' When we, with a chemical education, told him that there are several basic reasons why such procedure would be impractical, he remarked—You know too much to dream.

"Somewhat disturbed by that remark, because the director is a man of brains and experience, we passed along the question to a biologist who promptly agreed with us as to the present impracticability of finding a means of using sea water for plant growth, and the enormous difficulties presented, but he declined to say that it would eventually prove impossible. He pointed out that the inability of most land vegetation to thrive on sea water is merely a result of adaptation to environment; that there are vegetable forms, some of them land-based, which grow in sea water. He also told us of animal life in the sea with blood similar to that of our own, also a result of adaptation to environment. He did agree with us, however, that the areas which could profit most from land-based plantlife adapted to sea water, are those where combined transpiration and evaporation presently exceed precipitation. These are the areas which, after all other problems have been solved, would see a gradual increase in the saline content of the soil which might well prove to be an insuperable difficulty. By this time we were not so sure that our director had suggested an impossibility. With the help of science, plantlife which has already proven its ability to adapt itself to greatly varying degrees of salinity, given time and breeding, might prove to be further adaptable. So we asked a biochemist.

" 'Why bother with the problem?' said the biochemist. 'There is a nearer goal, and one probably more likely to be reached. The function of all agriculture is to furnish, directly or indirectly, food and certain materials for human use. We have come a long way on the road to producing a number of these materials by synthesis from inorganic sources. We have made a good start on the way toward synthesizing, also from inorganic sources, all foodstuffs essential to the healthy existence and growth of mankind. For the far-distant future, focus your efforts on synthetic biochemistry, and cease to worry about the future of agriculture.'

"By this time we were thoroughly confused, and we decided to ask our friend the economist. 'Your problem is only temporary, he told us. 'You were given the key by your biochemist friend. Every use of agriculture is for the satisfaction directly or indirectly, of human demands. Limit the number of human beings in a given self-supporting area, and, barring permanent major changes in climate, your problems of water supply for all purposes become more or less permanently controllable.' We asked him for a good formula for limiting population, but he did not have one.

"We have been thinking over all of this, and we are inclined to agree with our director that—We know too much to dream. His suggestion is indeed provocative."

If solvable, the problem of breeding agricultural plants which will thrive in untreated sea water will probably occupy researchers for many years and will cost a great deal of money, but the possible rewards are so great that we should not longer delay an organized attack.

American Policy in the Americas Restated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in the 1st session of the 89th Congress rather broad Latin American policy statements were enacted into law which have caused America considerable embarrassment in Latin American diplomatic circles and in the press.

In reply to a letter I sent to the State Department soliciting their position on congressional foreign policy statements subject to misinterpretation, I received the following reply.

The policy stated by Secretary Rusk is a good one which adherents to the Alliance for Progress policy can certainly support:

SEPTEMBER 30, 1965.

Mr. JACK H. VAUGHN,
Assistant Secretary of State, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VAUGHN: Pursuant to the telephone conversation today between your special assistant, Mr. Diego Ascencio and Mr. Wilber of my office, I respectfully request that you provide me with the State Department's official position respecting House Resolution 560.

I wish to further request the Department's position on Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 introduced by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

As this matter will be further debated in the House Chamber early next week, I would appreciate your immediate attention to this request.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, January 11, 1966.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LEGGETT: Thank you for your letter of September 30, 1965, asking for the Department's views on House Resolution 560 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, as introduced by Senator JAVITS.

I have deferred my reply to your letter until the Second Special Inter-American Conference completed its work so that I might send you the address of the Secretary of State made on November 22 at that Conference. The address makes a full presentation of U.S. policy, including the views of this Government on specific improvements necessary in the Inter-American system to enable it to act more promptly and effectively in time of crisis.

It is the Department's view that the Secretary's statement sets forth the position of the U.S. Government on the various points contained in the resolutions in question. The Department would prefer that the Secretary's address of November 22 at Rio de Janeiro stand as the single, authoritative expression of U.S. policy.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,
JACK H. VAUGHN,
Assistant Secretary.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK, SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DELIVERED AT THE FIFTH PLENARY SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE HELD ON NOVEMBER 22, 1965

I

Mr. Chairman, distinguished delegates and friends in the Americas; we gather once more as representatives of the American community of nations to join in making more effective the great purposes which move our peoples.

We are privileged to be in the beautiful city of Rio de Janeiro as it celebrated its 400th anniversary. In his founding proclamation in 1565, Estácio de Sá said: "Let our land be free, let us build a city, let these words remain as a memorial to our resolution and labor." May our resolution and labor at this Conference add to that memorial.

Seventy-five years ago our governments launched the inter-American system—the oldest and most successful experiment of its kind in international cooperation.

Today the influence of its principles and mechanisms may be seen in regional arrangements throughout the world.

The secret of our relationship is our common ideals. If we have not always been able to live up to these ideals, we have known better than to forsake them. The conscience of the New World—rooted in freedom and justice—remains solid and unchanged. At every critical moment of choice its asserts itself and determines the path we follow. Embedded deeply in the minds and hearts of our peoples, that conscience is the engine that drives us forward against all obstacles: whether we strive throughout the Hemisphere to implement the Charter of Punta del Este or—in my own country—to carry forward President Johnson's Great Society program.

II

Our purpose at this special Conference is to examine our regional system in the light of new circumstances and requirements within our hemisphere, as well as in the world around us. This is what our predecessors did in 1945 at Chapultepec as World War II drew to a close. This has been the pattern of development of the inter-American system since the beginning. The success of our system lies in the flexibility of its institutions—in its capacity to face unfolding reality. We have known how to experiment and to adapt—how to preserve that which serves our foreseeable needs and when to alter that which has become obsolete.

Probably no two decades in the history of mankind have witnessed such sweeping political, social, and technological transformation.

Since 1945 we have moved into the nuclear and space age. This has given a new dimension to the threat of war and to the necessity for peace.

Rapid advances in communications and transportation have removed the barriers of geographic isolation. Our interdependence within the hemisphere and in relation to other continents is greater today than ever before. No longer can we afford to view what takes place in Asia, Africa, or the Middle East as removed and unrelated to our security and welfare. And developments within each of our countries have become matters of vital concern to all.

Old colonial empires have all but disappeared. From them have emerged more than 50 new nations—some strong, some weak—enriching and complicating our international relations.

This family of sovereign states, old and new, is becoming day by day, a world political community; and no one knows this better than those of us who serve as foreign ministers.

Within that community underprivileged citizens in every society throughout the world have been swept up in the revolution of rising expectations, which we must now convert into a revolution of rising opportunities. They no longer regard their condition of poverty, isolation, ignorance, and disease as immutable. They insist that the lives of the children shall be better than their own. They clamor for change—rapid, far-reaching change.

III

Our hemisphere has experienced profoundly this universal phenomenon; and our governments, peoples, and international institutions have responded creatively.

The greatest and most complicated task which the inter-American system has faced in the past decade is the mobilization of collective efforts in support of a peaceful and democratic, economic and social revolution.

To accomplish this it has been necessary to adapt and devise regional institutions capable of assisting governments in their development and reform programs. The Act of Bogotá in 1960 for the first time placed social progress on a par with economic development. In 1960, the Inter-American Development Bank opened its doors. In March 1961, President Kennedy called on all the people of the hemisphere to join in a new Alliance for Progress, a vast cooperative effort unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose to satisfy the basic needs of the American people. In August 1961, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council approved the Charter of Punta del Este and launched the Alliance for Progress as the blueprint for a decade of development. The creation of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) in 1963 strengthened the original concept of the Alliance as a coopertaive effort. At its energizing core the Alliance has thus become truly multilateral.

The Alliance for Progress has seen some disappointments. Clearly there is still an enormous job to be done. But we in Washington have watched its unfolding with increasing hope and confidence. President Johnson last August described the 4 years of the Alliance as "the greatest period of forward movement, progress and peaceful change that we have ever made in the history of this hemisphere."

The statistics tell, in overall terms, a story of increased momentum throughout the hemisphere. Our general impression is confirmed by the expansion of schools and universities; houses and hospitals; measures for land and tax reform; the increase in the number and quality of development plans and programs; and by the expansion of job opportunities in the modern sectors of the Latin American economies.

Wherever one travels in Latin America, the earth is being turned and new foundations laid.

But our confidence in the success of the Alliance goes beyond what can be read in statistics and the fact of physical construction. What we see is that in one country after another governments and private citizens are focusing with increased seriousness, competence, and determination on practical measures of economic and social development. There is emerging—in both the public and private sectors—what one might call an Alliance for Progress generation.

We see the vision of our hemisphere fully modernized, absorbing and making regularly available to all the people the best that a rapidly unfolding modern science and technology can afford; a hemisphere loyal to its own rich history, tradition, and culture; loyal to the values of social justice, individual liberty, and representative democracy embedded in the Western civilization of which it is a vital part; offering to its citizens a widening range of opportunities to express their unique gifts, engaged in passionate struggle—not in class struggle but in common struggle against the ancient enemies of man: hunger, disease, and ignorance.

And, I would add as a North American, a vision of this modernized Latin America, increasingly integrated, bringing its special gifts responsibly to bear as a partner in all the great affairs both of the Atlantic and of the world.

This is a vision worthy of the highest values of a proud past—a vision in whose fulfillment a generation of Latin Americans will find a proud destiny.

In the next few months we will reach the halfway mark in the decade of the Alliance for Progress. Looking ahead for the next 5 years—and beyond—President Johnson has asked me to bring to you the following personal message:

"As I stated on August 17, on the fourth anniversary of the Alliance for Progress, our vital Alliance is perhaps the greatest adventure that this hemisphere has embarked upon since Columbus reached our shore five centuries ago. I also pledged my administration to helping all of our countries meet the goals of the Alliance.

"Recognizing that fulfillment of our goals will require the continuation of the joint effort beyond 1971, I wish to inform the conference—and through you, your respective governments—that the United States will be prepared to extend mutual commitments beyond the time period foreseen in the Charter of Punta del Este. In determining the scope of the U.S. effort, we will want to examine carefully with you at that time the requirements of the hemisphere, in the light of progress made through self-help measures and the contributions which by then some of your countries will be able to make to one another to further the common effort."

We are conscious that as the national plans and programs of our countries take shape and take hold, two great issues are coming to the fore: the question of accelerating Latin American economic integration and measures to increase Latin America's capacity to earn needed foreign exchange as its economies mature.

The future of Latin American economic integration is, of course, a question for you to decide. But we in the United States also have a deep and positive interest in it. We hope decisions to hasten integration will be taken sooner rather than later. Let no one in this hemisphere suppose that we in the United States are fearful of your unity—we welcome it. We have, therefore, noted with pleasure that in recent meetings of foreign ministers in both the Latin American Free Trade Area and the Central American Common Market decisions have been taken which give promise of accelerating the integration process.

We cannot now foresee the final structure of a Latin American economic community. We cannot foresee the role which your governments might wish the United States to play in relation to it. Our earnest hope is that it will maintain an intimate, cooperative, and constructive relationship with the United States. If together we can achieve that result, it would carry into the future the hemisphere tradition consecrated in the Charter of Bogotá and renewed and rededicated in the Charter of Punta del Este and the Alliance for Progress.

For there is an intimate relationship between national development and regional integration. A vital, integrated regional market must be based on vital, integrated national markets and, I would add, on an expanding, diversified international trade.

We accept wholly the proposition that trade and development are closely linked. What we need now are practical, concrete steps taken by both the developing countries and the industrialized countries that will in fact expand trade. The United States will continue to help Latin America to earn more foreign exchange from its own resources and efforts.

Working with countries inside and outside the hemisphere, we will do what we can to promote and participate in arrangements to stabilize and sustain the prices of the traditional products on which your foreign exchange earnings capacity still substantially depends. We are doing this in the case of the coffee agreement. We are also joining in a search for ways to develop a stabilizing arrangement in cocoa. We participated in the conference which developed the Third International Tin Agreement and we now have under active consideration the question of signature by the United States to that agreement.

We shall do what is possible to keep the U.S. market open to the traditional products of Latin America. The recent decision to remove quota restrictions on U.S. imports of lead and zinc, the elimination of the special import fee on sugar, and the allocation of sugar import quotas are earnests of our intentions. We shall also continue to press for the elimination of those discriminatory practices which work against Latin America on a world basis. And, as you know, in the Kennedy round negotiations on GATT, we are seeking the broadest possible degree of tariff reduction in both manufactures and agricultural products.

We support the programs of the IMF and IBRD looking to devices which would cushion short-term fluctuations in income resulting from export price fluctuations.

But we are all conscious that the future of Latin American trade must lie in the diversification, quality control, and competitiveness of its exports. In our work in the Alliance for Progress we are prepared to grant priority status in the supply of capital and technical assistance for such efforts. Each of your countries must design its own measures to encourage the diversification of exports. Our contribution will be geared to these national programs. But in the end only Latin Americans can overcome the habits and heritage of an industry and commerce built up in past generations behind excessive tariff barriers—tariff barriers which gave an initial impulse to industrialization but which now inhibit further expansion. Quite objectively I would suggest that this heritage may be the greatest single obstacle to both regional integration and the expansion of Latin American export earnings.

At the same time, we believe there would be great value in establishing an inter-American entity to support and coordinate export promotion activities to promote investment and research in Latin America, looking toward production for export and to provide support and encouragement for national export promotion activity in each of the Latin American countries. We believe it would be desirable for the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress (CIAP) to carry out studies looking toward the establishment of such an entity. Perhaps it could also develop plans for a model national export promotion agency, appropriate, with suitable adaptation to local conditions, for establishment in each of the countries. We realize that several of the Latin American countries have active and increasingly successful export promotion programs. But, clearly, there is a long road ahead. We believe that an inter-American agency, charged with the specific purpose of promoting Latin American exports, might make a useful and significant contribution.

The letter of CIAP to the presidents last August placed special emphasis on meeting the needs of rural Latin America. It is here where half the men, women, and children of Latin America live—and they are the poorest half. It is here where the struggle to build modern economies in Latin America will be won or lost. A radical and sustained increase in agricultural productivity in Latin America is a sheer necessity. But we must also devise ways to meet the social needs of the rural population—for housing and food, education and health. At the same time, we must help the campesino to increase his production, diversify his crops, and sell them at a fair and reliable price. This is an imperative area for improvement if Latin America is to grow the food, produce the raw materials, develop sound industrial plants, provide the national markets for industry, and earn the foreign exchange that will guarantee prosperity and dignity for the individual and the nation.

In this connection, I would repeat the recent pledge made by President Johnson. The United States is ready to assist in a continentwide effort to develop production within Latin America of fertilizer, pesticides, and other products that are needed to increase agricultural output.

One of the frontier areas of applied science which we have begun to explore is the use of atomic energy for large-scale water desalination. The international symposium recently held in Washington has opened new vistas. A practical application is the feasibility study agreement signed between Mexico, the United States, and the International Atomic Energy Agency for a plant along the United States-Mexican border. As we look into the future, we see these beginnings—as well as the possibilities of communications satellites and other advanced technologies—offering great opportunities for the development of our hemisphere.

When I speak of the problems which Latin America confronts in the economic and social fields and of the work we must do together under the Alliance to solve them, the problems we face in North America are equally in my mind. There are too many citizens in my country who are not participating fully in the social, material and political mainstream of our society. The dynamics of advanced industrial life and of exploding cities pose problems as searching and challenging as those confronted at earlier stages of development. This is why President Johnson launched his Great Society program, coupled with a major effort in the civil rights field.

We intend that every one of our citizens shall be able to exercise his right to vote; that the elderly citizens of our country shall have available the best of medical care; that our educational system will reach out, find, and develop every talented child and youth in our society and train the next generation so that they can cope with the problems of the future, not of the past; that pockets of poverty be eliminated; that the great problems of urban society be overcome. None of this will prove easy. None of it will be done overnight. But these are our active purposes.

In a real sense, the Great Society program is to be understood as our national effort to achieve the goals we have all set for ourselves in the Charter of Punta del Este. For, as President Johnson said last September, in announcing a new international effort in the field of education: "This Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge * * *."

The United States believes it would be desirable for the members of the Inter-American system to undertake charter commitments, one to another regarding the pursuit of those goals. These would be commitments among the members to take steps, severally, and together, in aid of the economic and social progress and the well-being of the nations of this hemisphere. In our view, the members of the OAS should undertake to act individually—through measures of self-help—and, in conjunction with the efforts of individual states to mobilize their own resources, to act cooperatively. Each member of the organization should be pledged to lend its assistance reciprocally to others in accordance with its constitutional processes.

IV

It is built deeply into our common values that economic development and social justice must be accompanied by respect for human rights and strengthened representative democracy. We have come to recognize that these two vital objectives are indivisible. For democratic institutions to prosper and personal freedom to flourish, the social and material needs of a people must be met. But, the reverse is also true. In order for a modern society to achieve sustained economic development, it is essential that its members have the freedom of expression and choice, of initiative and experimentation, to stimulate the creativity and drive which fuel the fires of modern economies. As we observe the performance of Communist regimes, we are increasingly convinced that human freedom is not only morally right, it is also the most efficient route to progress.

There are the underlying premises of our Charter of Punta del Este.

The other side of freedom is responsibility. The other side of the assertion of man's rights is his duty to respect and uphold the rights of his neighbor and the interest of the community. The earliest and most basic democratic texts, coming to us all from our common Mediterranean heritage, distinguished liberty from license, freedom from anarchy.

This dimension of democratic life has been driven in on us in my country as we have struggled to reconcile full employment with the avoidance of inflation; as we have worked to assure the political and social as well as the economic rights of all our citizens regardless of race or color; as we have set about to eliminate in our society the pockets of poverty. These enterprises require cooperation among every important segment of our national community, regardless of politics or social status. Such enterprises require, in a democracy, widespread consensus and acceptance of responsibility.

As I have observed the work of the American Republics—each seeking to carry out its government's commitments under the Charter of Punta del Este—I have been struck by the increasing recognition of this dimension of the democratic equation. I see coalitions beginning to emerge which, essentially, place national development plans above day-to-day politics. I see the beginning of efforts to check inflation by cooperation among government, industry, and labor. The building of this sense of common purpose will, I suspect, prove as important in the southern as in the northern portion of our hemisphere in the years and decades ahead. In free societies the struggle to preserve human freedom, to assure each of our citizens a full measure of particpation in the democratic process, and to build what North Americans would call consensus—and what some of our Latin American friends might call the social contract—is never ending.

A sound point of departure in considering these issues is recognition of the fact that respect for human rights and the responsible exercise of representative democracy must grow from within, murtured by economic progress, social maturity, and cultural advancement. The integral approach to development and reform under the Alliance for Progress is designed to help create these conditions.

In the field of human rights much remains to be done in our countries. Mine is no exception. Other nations of the hemisphere confront problems peculiar to their own societies. Looking back over the last few decades, I think notable progress has been made in the hemisphere in extending basic democratic rights to all our citizens. Progress may, perhaps, not be uniform. We may grow impatient with the pace. But the trend is definitely forward.

The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights is playing a significant role in this process. The responsible and efficient manner in which its members have performed their duties also deserves our warm praise. The confidence placed by the Dominican people in the Commission during recent months is to tribute to its effectiveness. Its efforts—added to the moral suasion of governments through encouragement, reaffirmation of principles and example, and the Alliance—constitute, I am convinced, the most effective tools now at our disposal to advance the cause of individual freedom.

We confront comparable difficulties in trying to promote representative democracy and constitutional government. In this area perhaps the problems are even more complex than in the field of human rights. The overthrow by force of constitutionally elected governments is to be deplored. But we all know that political development is a complex historical process and that simple, abstract formulas are not necessarily the guide to wise assessments.

Therefore, we need to examine coups not in general but in particular—on a case-by-case basis. A proposal advanced several months ago that the American governments agree to consult together when unconstitutional changes occur in the hemisphere, is a good one. In this way the facts can be examined, and each government can decide on the course which it will follow in the light of those facts and of the views of the other governments.

The regular ministerial consultations which many of us now envisage might permit us to discuss intimately and with candor problems of this type before they become acute. By deepening our common understanding of the political forces at work in the various parts of the hemisphere, we might be able to contribute to the strengthening of democratic process.

V

I turn now to the problems posed for us by the hard, continuing fact of aggressive Communist activities on the world scene and in our hemisphere.

Freemen fight communism because Communists—as a matter of doctrine, policy, and action—have sought to divert, subvert, and destroy what freemen aim to build.

Since World War II international communism has moved aggressively on the world scene with doctrines and tactics for world conquest. Behind the false banner of "wars of national liberation," communism seeks to accomplish by subversion what it knows it cannot achieve by democratic process or by open warfare. This is the issue in Vietnam. This explains the betrayal of the Cuba revolution. This was the design when Latin American Communist Parties met in Havana a year ago. This is the objective of the guerrillas fighting in several of your countries. This is why all of us in this hemisphere must be constantly on the alert against subversive action whether inspired from Moscow, Havana, or Peiping.

Communists are apparently now dusting off one of their older doctrines for renewed emphasis in this hemisphere: the doctrine of "popular fronts." A Soviet writer recently described developments in the Dominican Republic "the beginning of a new period in which the conditions are being created for broad national, anti-imperialist fronts." In Marshal Lin Piao's famous article of September 2, he also counsels, as a first step toward Communist takeover, "using the weapon of the united front." And he adds ominously: "Within the united front, the Communist Party must maintain its ideological, political, and organizational independence * * * and insist on its leading role."

In all conscience, after a generation's experience of Communist tactics, there is little reason for any of us to be deceived by their familiar, old-fashioned tricks.

I would like to touch for a few moments on the situation in Vietnam. This is but the latest of a series of efforts by Communist powers to extend their imperialism by force of arms. Since 1945 we have seen these efforts in Greece, in Berlin, in Korea, in North Vietnam, in India, and now in South Vietnam. These engagements were not isolated, local incidents. They were part of a pattern to probe the defenses of the free world—to test our will, to sap our strength, to open doors for greater conquests. We have been required to meet the challenge. The cost in blood and treasure has been high. But this is the price for protecting freedom—not only of the countries directly concerned, but of freedom throughout the world. For what is taking place today in Vietnam is not only the struggle of the Vietnamese people and those fighting by their side; it is also your struggle and that of every other free nation.

The impact of Communist aggression has been sharply felt in our hemisphere. In 1959 communism gained a foothold in our hemisphere. Turning his back on the inter-American system, Castro joined forces with the Soviet Union and converted Cuba into a base for Communist subversion. At Punta del Este in January 1962, we moved to protect ourselves by declaring communism to be incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system and suspending the Castro regime from further participation in the system. At the same time, we urged member states to take those steps they may consider appropriate for their individual or collective self-defense in the face of Communist indirect aggression.

National and collective action has reduced, although it has by no means yet eliminated, the flow of arms and funds and subversive propaganda; the training of men in guerrilla warfare; and other actions designed to undermine the security of our peoples.

In October 1962, we faced the grave threat of Soviet offensive missiles in Cuba. By acting swiftly and decisively under the Rio Treaty, we brought about their prompt withdrawal.

Two years ago, Venezuela was the victim of a flagrant subversive effort directed from Cuba. Again the Rio Treaty operated to help the Venezuelan people meet this challenge. In the process, the system served notice on the Castro regime that indirect aggression, like direct armed attack, would not be tolerated by the Americas. We made clear that the principle of individual or collective self-defense may be applied in either circumstance.

Our common hemispheric purposes in the Dominican Republic are simple. In 1960, the governments of the hemisphere decided that the actions of the Trujillo regime required the imposition of political and economic sanctions. In 1962 we declared Marxist-Leninism incompatible with the inter-American system. What we are doing now is providing the citizens of the Dominican Republic the opportunity to choose a government which is neither of the Trujillo nor the Castro variety; for we know that when the people register their consent in the Dominican Republic—as elsewhere throughout the hemisphere—they will reject both extremes.

Given the tragic history of the Dominican Republic in the past two generations, we know the task will not be easy. But we all can play our part confident that our mission conforms to the most basic shared values and purposes of the inter-American system.

VI

There is, I think, a general and increasing awareness of the need for vigilance by the American Republics to safeguard its own institutions and democratic processes against threats of totalitarian takeover and rule, whether coming from the extreme right or from the extreme left. This is a national responsibility—one for each nation to solve for itself in its own way. Apart from the requirements of national action, this Conference can usefully consider what developments and changes in our organization would strengthen its ability to act in support of hemispheric peace and security.

The ability of the inter-American system to act promptly in times of crises has been reassuring for the future. But it is well for us at this stage in our development to take another look at our institutions and our methods in order to see whether we can improve upon them.

This Conference should decide how we might best proceed with the consideration of specific improvements in the inter-American system which our deliberations disclose as necessary. It seems to me that the task might be entrusted after this Conference to one or more bodies which would carry forward our work in preparation for a special conference, under article III of the charter, to meet possibly within the next 6 months.

At this stage I should like to advance for consideration some of the ideas that the United States believes could contribute to making our organization a more effective instrument.

First, the United States favors annual OAS meetings at ministerial level. The interaction and speed of developments in our hemisphere and elsewhere make it highly desirable that we meet with more regularity and frequency than we have before. The consultations should not be confined to our hemispheric problems alone. Developments in other areas might be reviewed both for their implications for us, as well as for what we might do to further the cause of peace and freedom elsewhere.

Second, we should strengthen the organizational relationship among the key organs of the system: the Ministers, the Council, the Economic and Social Council, CIAP, and the Secretariat. Our objective should be to integrate the various facets of our collective effort; to insure they are responsive to the agreed policies of governments; to insure that cooperation in the political, economic, social and cultural fields are mutually reinforcing and to insure that new operational tasks are carried forward with administrative efficiency and dispatch.

Third, in our forward planning we should think not only of measures to deal with a conflagration once it has broken out, but also of preventive steps the Organization might helpfully take in a dispute or situation in this hemisphere before it has reached the crisis stage. There is wisdom in the old diplomatic tradition—incorporated in United Nations doctrine—that bilateral disputes are best settled bilaterally. Nevertheless, the Council might be empowered to consider a dispute or situation at the request of one or more American Republics; to recommend procedures for peaceful settlement; and perhaps to recommend provisional measures designed to prevent an aggravation of the situation. The Council, in carrying out such functions, could avail itself of assistance from the Inter-American Peace Committee, from special commissions, and from the Secretary General.

Fourth, the United States would also support strengthening the institution and role of the Secretary General, authorizing him to bring to the attention of the Council any matter which, in his opinion, may endanger peace and security in the hemisphere.

Fifth, there is the question of joint action. Both in the Cuban missile crisis and in the Dominican situation, the discharge by the OAS of its responsibilities involved not merely the assumption of political responsibility but also the employment of units of the armed forces of various member states. These were contributed voluntarily and operated collectively under a combined command. In the crises of 1962, this action was decisive. In the case of the Dominican Republic, the Inter-American Peace Force made a vital contribution to the avoidance of needless bloodshed and the creation of conditions for the Dominican people to determine their own future by votes and not by arms. Its importance is attested by the fact that the Provisional government has called upon it for continued assistance in the maintenance of peace and stability.

The United Nations has, of course, had much more experience than has the OAS in this type of multilateral peacekeeping force. Many of your countries have made personnel available for both United Nations observation and military operations in several crisis situations.

It may, therefore, be useful for us to examine, in the light of experience and the nature of our collective responsibilities for paece and security in the hemisphere, and elsewhere, the desirability of establishing these voluntary contributions to international peacekeeping operations on a more orderly basis in advance of their possible future use by the OAS or by the U.N.

If we face the fact that we live in troubled times, if we face the fact that there are those who seek with purpose and persistence to destroy democracy. I believe, if we are patient, we shall find a creative way to recognize two important principles: first, we ought to be prepared to move fast and effectively and, if possible, together when a dangerous situation arises in the hemisphere; second, none of our governments is prepared to engage its military forces except by a national decision, at the highest level, in the light of particular circumstances.

Sixth, I would note the need to avoid within our hemisphere competitive arms races. Our resources are desperately needed for economic and social development. With all its imperfections we are blessed by the most mature and reliable system for regional security and peacekeeping on the face of the planet. As military budgets are formulated we should keep these facts before us—and the examples, past and present, of the burdens and consequences of all arms races.

The experience of the Cuban missile crises gave to the Western Hemisphere a heightened awareness of the need to control modern weapons and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. One of the initiatives that received added impetus in 1962 was the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. The United States has followed with keen and sympathetic interest the efforts of Latin American countries to work out agreed arrangements for excluding the proliferation, the stationing, or storage of nuclear weapons within the territory of Latin American States. We have noted the encouraging progress toward this end which was made during the current year at discussions in Mexico City. The United States believes the project of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America is constructive statesmanship in the best tradition of the hemisphere. We welcome the effort and would be glad to see it reach a successful conclusion.

I should also note that our membership may expand.

The emergence of two new, independent states—Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago—caused our organization to devise a formula for the admission of members. We found the formula without need to alter the charter. The door is now open to additional countries to join the OAS. We will welcome them wholeheartedly at such time as they wish to avail themselves of this opportunity.

VII

This, as we see it, is the panorama of our common tasks.

The intent of my country to work with you in the common quest for freedom and prosperity has never been as strong as it is today—to build together and together to protect what we are building. President Johnson has summed it up this way:

"Our charter charges each American country to seek to strengthen representative democracy. Without that democracy and without the freedom it nourishes, material progress is an aimless enterprise, destroying the dignity of the spirit that it is really meant to liberate. So we will continue to join with you and encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle."

Thus we would reaffirm the faith of my Government in the effectiveness and vitality of our regional system. It has served to bring new levels of understanding and good will between our peoples. It has served to promote freedom and democracy. It has served, and is increasingly serving, as a means for achieving material well-being and social justice for our nations. It has served to keep the peace in this hemisphere and to protect us from our enemies.

The Organization has demonstrated its flexibility and adaptability to change in the past. I am confident that it will continue to do so in the future.

The challenge in this old hemispheric system is like the challenge of domestic political life: to transform and modernize policies and institutions in harmony with abiding principles and values, so that the problems of today and tomorrow can be met.

Together I am confident we shall meet that challenge.

The 48th Anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Ukraine. On this occasion, Americans of Ukrainian descent all across the land took part in special observances to once again bring to the attention of the world how a free, independent nation was forced under the yoke of communism.

In a recent letter to me, Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president of the North Dakota branch of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., discusses the special programs planned for North Dakota. These included special religious services which were broadcast over radio and television throughout a broad area of North Dakota.

In his letter, Dr. Zukowsky made an excellent case for setting forth the necessity of maintaining our commitment to the people of the Ukraine and other nations who live under Communist tyranny. We cannot forget these people and their desire to obtain freedom. We must continue to support them and help them to advance in every possible way the independence they seek.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Zukowsky's letter printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ukrainian Congress
Committee of America, Inc.,
State Branch of North Dakota,
Steele, N. Dak., January 15, 1966.

Hon. Milton R. Young,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Young: We want to again call to your attention that in the month of January Ukrainians all over the world including our State, will mark the 48th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine, which took place on the 22d of January in Kiev, the capitol of Ukraine, also the 47th anniversary of the Act of Union on January 22, 1919, whereby Western Ukraine united with the National Ukrainian Republic into one sovereign and independent republic of the Ukrainian people.

Although the Ukrainian Republic was recognized by a number of States, including the Government of Soviet Russia, it had no durable peace nor prosperity because Communist Russia invaded the Ukrainian state despite its previous pledges to respect and honor the Ukrainian independence.

For nearly 3½ years, without assistance from the Western World, the Ukrainian people waged a heroic war against Communist Russia in the defense of sovereignty of their country but the gallant struggle came to a tragic end. The free Ukrainian state was subdued to a puppet regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic.

Since the Russian Communist enslavement with brutal oppression and domination there has been much suffering among these people. But despite the Communist yoke imposed by Moscow, the Ukrainian people never accepted the foreign domination and are continuing to struggle for freedom and national independence. Through a series of heroic and bloody uprisings and a steady resistance through underground warfare, the Ukrainian people have demonstrated their undying love of freedom and their opposition to alien slavery and oppression.

Both the Congress and the President of the United States have recognized the legitimate right to freedom and national independence by enacting and signing respectively the "Captive Nations Week Resoltuion" in July 1959, which enumerated the Ukraine as one of the captive nations enslaved and dominated by Communist Russia, and is entitled to recognition and moral support by the American people and the free world at large. During the debate on colonialism in the U.N. Assembly in 1960 and 1961 a number of Western statesmen, including our Ambassador to the U.N. raised their voices in protest against the persecution of the Ukrainian people by the Communists.

The cause of Ukrainian freedom and independence is no longer a patriotic desire since the Communist menace has spread into Asia, our shores in Cuba and Latin America, it has become a political necessity for the free world to recognize that an independent Ukraine would substantially weaken the Communist empire.

Americans of Ukrainian descent in our great State of North Dakota are planning to celebrate the forthcoming 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence on Sunday, January 23, 1966, in a solemn and fitting manner with special religious services and programs which will be heard on radio and TV over stations in Bismarck, Mandan, Minot, and Dickinson.

We firmly believe that you are fully aware of the importance of Ukraine as an ally in the struggle against Russian Communist imperialism. We, therefore, respectfully request that you make an appropriate statement on the floor of the Senate on or about the 22d of January in commemoration of the 48th anniversary of the Ukrainian independence. This anniversary provides an appropriate occasion not only for the U.S. Senate and American people but also for the U.S. Government to demonstrate their sympathy and understanding of the aspirations of the Ukrainian people.

It may also provide better understanding by extending diplomatic relations to Ukraine, which is a charter member of the United Nations, by nominating an American of Ukrainian descent to serve on some diplomatic post, and by the issuance of a commemorative stamp in honor of Europe's freedom fighter and Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko.

We extend our sincere thanks and appreciation for the favorable response in the past on this and other matters, and we hope that you will continue to accept our expressions with meaningful understanding.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Anthony Zukowsky,
President, UCCA, State Branch of North Dakota.

No Quick, Easy Solution to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, after a visit to Vietnam last month I concluded that the most important contribution the average American can make to the war in Vietnam is patience. There is no quick and easy solution.

The nationally syndicated writer, Ralph McGill, in a recent column, compared the fighting conditions in Vietnam to an episode in our own history. He noted that Marion the Swamp Fox, using guerrilla tactics, "kept a large force of well-equipped British troops engaged across a long period of time." Four major expeditions by the British against him were unsuccessful.

Indeed it is frustrating to hold the power to devastate completely an entire enemy country and not be able to use that power.

Mr. McGill's column, published in the January 13 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, is an excellent answer to the question: "Why not win in Vietnam?"

Under leave to extend my remarks I include it at this point in the Record:

NEITHER POWER NOR VICTORY ARE ENOUGH FOR VIETNAM

(By Ralph McGill)

Atlanta.—"Why not victory now?" "Why not win in Vietnam?" "Why don't we get it over with?"

"What's wrong with winning?" "Why can't this great power kick out that rabble of guerrillas in Vietnam?"

These and other idiocies, born of frustration, echo in the land of the free and the home of the brave. (It is a land that ought to understand, out of its own history, the frustration in Vietnam. Our own history includes Marion, the Swamp Fox. He based himself in a swamp and kept a large force of well-equipped British troops engaged across a long period of time. On four occasions, major expeditions were mounted against him. He eluded them. Marion was one of the factors that enabled final victory to be won. The more effective units of our continental army were, in effect, guerrilla troops, operating out of their knowledge of terrain and of living off the country.)

The United States would win. Winning would, in a sense, be easy. Congressman Charles Weltner, speaking in his Georgia district, said to the impatient and frustrated:

"Certainly, it would be a simple matter to bring about, within 24 hours, the utter devastation of all of North Vietnam. We could kill every able-bodied fighting man there—along with every little child, every woman, every old man—all within the twinkling of an eye. We can win—if winning means wiping out 16 million human beings; and if winning includes the very real chance of direct military engagement with Communist China; and if winning includes the probable necessity for using nuclear weapons against Peiping; and if winning includes the possible destruction of Russia—after, of course, Russia has simultaneously destroyed 100 million American lives.

"We have the power to win—if we want to win under these circumstances. That power has gone unexercised, to the mounting frustration of us all, and to the increasing demand that we do something. We sincerely seek an honorable peace and, I am convinced, are willing to go the extra mile. We will not, however, negotiate a peace that would mean the inevitable loss of southeast Asia to the thralldom of China."

The world should have learned out of its many wars and "victories" that great power is not enough—not nearly enough. Nor is "victory" enough. Two tremendous wars enveloped most of the earth. They were "won" with a vast mobilization of power, men, materials, and food. A Korean war was waged, bloodily and indecisively.

It was said of this harsh conflict that it was waged to contain Communist aggression. That was true. But it was not all the truth. We were then, as now, confronted with two Communist giants. Since that time, the second one, China, has detonated two nuclear devices. More are on the way. Russia, believing that communism eventually will triumph, seems willing, in the face of power, to build her own economy and avoid aggression. China, with a growing birthrate and an increasingly serious lack of food and viability in her economy, believes in and seeks aggression. Yet, in the last 2 months her attempts to infiltrate and subvert African governments have failed. A plot to make Indonesia a Peiping puppet was thwarted.

Peiping-trained Thailanders now are in open opposition in north Thailand. The story goes on and on.

Neither power alone, nor victory alone, is enough. What this country seeks to do is to mobilize all our power—our wealth of goods, money and arms—to seek the slow way, a new sort of "victory."

Heart Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article from the New York Times of January 10, 1966, noting the election of Philip P. Ardery of Louisville, Ky., as chairman of the board of directors of the American Heart Association.

Mr. Ardery distinguished himself in World War II, leading an air squadron on D-day and since has been equally distinguished as a member of the bar and as a devoted worker in the field of civic affairs.

I am sure that he will continue to provide effective leadership to the American Heart Association as chairman of the board of directors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

LOUISVILLE MAN HEADS HEART GROUP

The election of Philip P. Ardery as chairman of the board of directors of the American Heart Association was announced yesterday. Mr. Ardery, a Louisville lawyer, succeeds John D. Brundage. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower continues as honorary chairman of the association.

Mr. Ardery retired last July as a major general in the Air Force Reserve. In World War II he won seven U.S. decorations and the Croix de Guerre.

Active for more than a decade in heart association work, Mr. Ardery has been a member of the group's national board and executive committee since 1958. In 1962 he received the association's award of merit for distinguished service to its programs.

One of Our Commissioners Is Missing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the following communication has been sent by me to the House Republican conference, but I believe it may prove of interest to all our colleagues:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION VACANCY—FAILURE TO FILL

For almost 7 months—since July 1, 1965—a vacancy has existed on the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. This vitally important body with an annual budget exceeding $2 billion is functioning at 80 percent of its statutory manpower level. The management of its vast complex of scientific and industrial activities rides heavy on the shoulders of four rather than a proper complement of five supervising Commissioners. The input of thought, judgment, experience and wisdom into Commission decisions affecting both U.S. nuclear defense and American progress in peaceful uses of the atom continues month after month to remain starved by a factor of 20 percent.

Yet the Johnson administration remains totally unconcerned. Washington hears not the slightest rumor whatever of any possibility of a new Commissioner to replace Dr. Mary I. Bunting, who returned to the campus of Radcliffe College last June 30.

This regrettable state of affairs follows on the heels of an equally regrettable body blow to the Commission's force level dealt by the same Johnson administration in 1964. This involved the appointment of Dr. Bunting herself in that year with the understanding and agreement of the White House that she would remain away from her teaching responsibilities only for a year. During her year in Washington, Dr. Bunting proved to be a brilliant, hard working, and able Commissioner. Expectedly, however, most of her year was devoted to learning the job. She left, therefore, at the very moment of emergence into a capability to assume her full share of the Commission's workload.

The administration knew, or should have known, at the time it appointed her that such would be the case. There were other candidates for the 1964 vacancy who were willing and able to serve the full term, which Dr. Bunting was not. Nevertheless, she was selected, because at that moment the administration was going through one of its periodic "appoint women to office" weeks.

All of this is a record of bad government administration. The people should know it. They are entitled to something better. The Commission vacancy should be filled promptly by a person of high competence who will agree to serve the term.

Roy Wilkins on Hogwash

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of nonsense is being spoken and written today by individuals in an effort to ridicule this Nation's efforts to cope with the causes and effects of poverty.

Two columnists writing in the current issue of the Indianapolis Observer provide a most welcome change from what appears to be an increasingly active and deliberately misleading campaign.

Neither Roy Wilkins nor John Ackelmire, the Observer's columnists, will allow to go unchallenged the bumper stickers which smugly proclaim, "I'm fighting poverty. I work for a living."

These two writers display honesty and realism in discussing the difficult circumstances in which the unwilling victims of the "new technology" find themselves. For that reason, I take this opportunity to insert their comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Observer]

ROY WILKINS ON HOGWASH

It is easy for most white people to think of Negro life as one long physical hardship. They remember lynchings and the victims of beatings and shootings. They know about bombings and burned-out homes and churches.

Where Negroes are free of all this, or most of it, the public cries out, along with the young California guardsman in Watts: "What do they want? They never had it so good. These are not slums like Harlem."

There are other cruelties besides lynching and the Negro is not insensitive to them. One is the popular myth that the race doesn't want to work, that it prefers welfare payments.

Today the not-so-subtle insult is repeated by rightwing critics and speakers and parrots belonging to this or that society, but calling themselves generally, "conservatives." The latest dig is to be found on automobile bumper stickers:

"I'm fighting poverty. I work for a living."

The implication is as plain as it is smug. It says there is work aplenty for those who want to work. It says that those who do not work are deliberately choosing the assistance of antipoverty and welfare programs. It says, further, with an air of self-righteousness, "We who work are paying the bills for those who choose to enjoy poverty."

Every student of the most elementary economics of a capitalistic society knows this to be hogwash, and pretty smelly even for that concoction.

Statistics don't mean so much to people who think and live by slogans, but the fact is that 3 million Americans are hunting for work and cannot get a job. In the midst of our affluence we simply have not solved the problem of what to do about workers dislodged by technology, not by laziness.

One element of the formula for unemployment is a dark skin. It is true nationally that the unemployment rate for Negroes is twice that for whites, but in some localities it is as much as four times the white rate. In the Watts district of Los Angeles last August 1 out of every 3 Negroes was unemployed.

In Michigan computers are bringing thousands of different cars off the assembly line equipped by orders on punchcards. In Ohio a machine drills 250 cylinder blocks at once. In Louisiana a computer fills drums with chemicals. In Chicago a computer mixes and bakes cakes. On a single Dixie plantation a cottonpicking machine displaces 50 Negro families.

These changes and wholesale regional and family disruptions and the myriad personal tragedies that flow from them will not be remedied by the auto-bumper philosophers. They are too busy working—until they reach the brutal cutoff age of 45, that is.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Observer]

JOHN ACKELMIRE: THE DISINHERITED

Come along to the slave market. It is in front of the old city hall at Ohio and Alabama. The scene could be—but won't be—especially instructive to those social illiterates one generation removed from honest Hoosier barnyards who have managed to translate their fiscal luck in this fabulous economy into a self-righteous contempt for the unemployed.

Each morning long before sunup 2 dozen or more jobless Negroes gather at the curbstone on North Alabama in hope somebody will come by and offer them an honest day's toil. There are a few winos and incompetents among them. But the vast majority are versatile, able-bodied men about as desperate for employment as it is possible to be. They arrive, poorly clad against the predawn's icy bite, and they stand on the sidewalk in orderly array until picked up or hope is abandoned.

Do they enjoy poverty? Are they living high off the hog on welfare? Do they deserve to be insulted by bumper stickers reading, "I'm fighting poverty, I work for a living"?

Fred Gibson is 63. He lives at 2238 North College and walks the distance each morning to the curbstone in the 200 block of North Alabama. He is twice a widower; his second wife died last February after a 26-year marriage. He has 4 grown children and 13 grandchildren. He is the sole support of one daughter, now separated from her husband, and two grandchildren. The daughter is expecting a third child in 3 months.

Fred Gibson has lived in Indianapolis more than 40 years. He never got beyond the fifth grade, although his felicitous manner of speech and wide range of self-gathered knowledge suggest considerably more formal education. In his time he has had some fair jobs—landscape gardening, construction work, hod carrying and fry cooking. The only really well-paying job he ever had, though, was a brief stint in a World War II war plant. He never has owned a house or car.

But neither has he ever been on public welfare nor has he ever gone to a township trustee for relief. He has no police record. "I have always tried to be a man," he said the other day, "and part of that is holding a steady job."

In recent times a steady job has eluded Fred Gibson. So he goes down to the curbstone each morning in hope of a day's pick-and-shovel or tile-laying work. If he is lucky, he may make as much as $25 or $30 a week. His rent takes $16 of that. ("I don't know how I'm going to pay this week's rent," he said.)

Roy Conn, 55, of 308 West 10th, has lived in Indianapolis since 1928. He is a graduate of Louisville Central High School. For 17 years he parked cars in a downtown lot, but of late he has had to catch as catch can at the curbstone. Neither he nor his wife ever has been on relief.

Edward Taylor of 810 North Illinois made it through the eighth grade. He was in civil service work at Oak Ridge, Tenn., then was transferred to Fort Harrison "until the soldiers took over" in 1949. Since then he has been unable to find steady employment.

Most of the other men I talked with have similarly steady, modest backgrounds. They are grateful to have the curbstone job mart as a door to temporary employment. They prefer that it not be called the "slave market." Their pay runs from 75 cents to $1.25 or $1.50 an hour as a rule, depending upon the type of work they get.

Most of these good men are victims of the new technology. They are among 3 million employable but unemployed Americans. To most of these beyond the twenties or thirties, retraining and other war on poverty devices offer scant prospects.

What they need is what Fred Gibson said is part of being a man—steady jobs. And they need them now. This strongly suggests a need for Federal action to create those jobs. It was Abraham Lincoln, not Karl Marx, who said the Government "should do for the people what the people cannot do themselves or as well themselves."

Affirmation: Vietnam

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, the university and college students of Georgia have initiated and organized Affirmation: Vietnam, a project which has my approval and unqualified support. My colleagues here in the House have expressed their pride in these young people, and I join with them in applauding this expression of constructive patriotism.

The original impetus came from a group of students at Emory University in Atlanta, and now includes representation and support from most colleges and universities throughout the State. Its sponsors include Senators Richard B. Russell and Herman Talmadge and other notable Georgians and Atlantans, as well as the entire Georgia delegation to the House of Representatives. Remar M. Sutton, Jr., is providing excellent coordination of the movement in his capacity as general chairman.

The culmination of Affirmation: Vietnam will be a rally at Atlanta Stadium on February 12. It is a very special honor that Secretary of State Dean Rusk, a native Georgian and product of Georgia schools, will make the major address.

Students have traditionally and historically occupied a unique place in our society. Their enthusiasm and intelligence have been joined to many causes, and they have not hesitated to debate the issues with clear candor, and without regard to personal gain.

In recent months, the students voice has often protested our commitment in southeast Asia. Therefore, this spontaneous movement by Georgia students is deeply gratifying and reassuring.

I am proud to be connected with this project, and I hope that the demonstration of support for the reasoned principles of our country's commitment will be noted by the rest of our Nation.

Johnson and Party Repairing Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently, under leave to insert my own remarks and include extraneous matter, I had inserted in the Record an article by Walter Pincus relative to the Democratic National Committee finances. Another of his articles on the same subject appeared in the Sunday Star of January 23. In order to complete the story, the article follows:

Money and Politics—Johnson and Party Repairing Image

(By Walter Pincus)

Stung by recent criticism, President Johnson and his top political aids are moving to improve the Democratic Party's darkened fundraising image.

At the same time, however, financial demands of this year's congressional election activities may resurrect the bad image just as fast as the Democrats try to knock it down.

As a first step in image building, negotiations are underway to transfer some $600,000 raised by the newest $15,000 a page Democratic ad book to a bipartisan foundation which—with matching funds from the Republican National Committee—would openly conduct voter registration drives prior to next fall's election.

The ad book, which drew funds from 68 corporations, was promoted by the Democrats last summer behind a veil of secrecy. As originally conceived, the proceeds were to go to Democratic candidates who distribute the books at fundraising movie premieres.

DIRECT MAIL PLAN

As a second image-building step, the Democrats soon will begin a modest direct mail solicitation for small contributions. In recent years, the Democrats have received almost 80 percent of their funds from donors of over $100—most of them $1,000 givers.

An effort last year to stimulate small contributions through a contest was a dismal failure. So few people entered that winners at the State level have not even been announced.

President Johnson, himself, started off the new fundraising approach with his campaign fund reform proposals in the state of the Union message. Among the suggestions—still to be transmitted in detail to Congress—was a tax relief proposal for political contributions. This is aimed at stimulating small donations.

In contrast to the Democrats, the Republican Party has since 1962 reported raising a sizable proportion of its funds from donors of $100 or less.

As politically attractive as the imagemaking proposals are, they actually will cost more money than they will raise.

With the need to raise some $4 million this year to support the national Democratic program, party leaders hope their top fundraiser—the President—will be able to carry out appearances at five or six dinners around the country.

The President's recent gall bladder operation cost the national committee some $1 million. Almost $400,000 of that figure would have been collected at a California function Johnson had planned to attend. When he was unable to go, the California promoters refused to hold the affair and held onto some $300,000 already collected. That event apparently has been rescheduled for April.

TWO WASHINGTON EVENTS

Several fundraising appearances of Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, which bring in additional funds to Washington, were canceled when the President asked him to stay in Washington during his postoperative period.

This year, along with out-of-town Presidential appearances, the Democrats are planning on two affairs in Washington to bring in money.

The financial attraction of the Nation's Capital as a campaign fund source is irresistible. The entire take of an affair, rather than just half the proceeds, go to the Democratic National Committee. In addition, the city is bulging with people who understand politics and respond to requests for contributions.

Lobbyists, trade association representatives, and Government employees to make the city the best place to hold either a dinner—as has been suggested for this spring—or an entertainment gala—as is being talked of for midsummer.

However, fundraising in Washington has its drawbacks—the prime one being the uproar over organized Democratic solicitation of Federal employees. Such protests have developed over the past 5 years.

All the attempts at imagemaking could be destroyed if the party resumes its intricate, organized, and illegal solicitation of Federal employees by their more politically oriented coworkers.

INQUIRY IS CLOSED

Last year, the Civil Service Commission and the Justice Department were forced to review the activities of officials in the Rural Electrification Administration after allegations were made and partially confirmed that tickets to the 1964 Johnson gala were being sold on office time to subordinates.

Justice recently announced it had closed the inquiry without finding sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution.

Such organized in-house soliciting also was planned for last year's Democratic congressional dinner. Though it was stopped in some departments after being revealed in the press, other agencies carried it on successfully.

Another aspect of Democratic 1966 fundraising will be promotion of the $1,000 a membership President's Club, which since 1964 has supplied a heavy proportion of the party's funds. Though it creates the "fat cat" image, the President's Club funds will be needed to provide the major part of this year's campaign money.

Tomorrow, Humphrey and other top administration and party leaders will attend the New York City President's Club kickoff meeting. Over 500 have been invited to attend the closed briefing—and subsequently contribute $1,000 to the party.

Similar events are being set up around the country, and probably will precede both the Washington and out-of-town fundraising appearances of Johnson.

SECOND AD BOOK DOUBTFUL

The bad publicity generated by this year's ad book limits chances that another book will be attempted this year. However, if the need for funds demand it, the Democrats may put together a volume to accompany the gala.

Over 100,000 of this year's book—a valentine to President Johnson entitled "Toward an Age of Greatness"—have yet to be distributed. Since less than 80 movie premieres were held—and some of the Congressmen sponsoring them barred distribution of the controversial book—the Democrats have been scratching around for ways to put the volume in circulation.

Advertisers were promised a circulation of 250,000 in order to justify their $15,000 as a legitimate deductible advertising expense on their tax returns. In order to protect these corporations, the Democrats now plan to send the books out to State party headquarters for distribution to party members.

Iowa Students Launch Crusade for Stamp Honoring Servicemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have noted with pleasure that students and faculty members at North Junior High School in Sioux City, Iowa, have launched a crusade in behalf of a new postage stamp honoring American servicemen. They are to be commended for this patriotic action and I would hope that the Post Office Department will act favorably on their suggestion.

Following is an article about the crusade which appeared in the Sioux City Journal:

NORTH JUNIOR'S SERVICEMEN'S FLAG PROJECT GROWS INTO STAMP CRUSADE

An idea has blossomed into a near-crusade among students and faculty members of North Junior High School here. And out of it all may come a new postage stamp to bring America closer to her fighting men around the globe.

An artist's conception of an 8-cent air mail stamp, using the design of an American flag with the words "American Servicemen, We Appreciate You," has been sent to Lawrence O'Brien, Postmaster General. The proposed stamp grew out of the same design that appears on a billboard here along Gordon Drive.

RECEIVES NATIONAL PUBLICITY

That billboard was the idea and project of students of the school, to show their moral support of American servicemen on duty throughout the world. The large sign, put up last week, received national publicity when a photograph of it was sent to newspapers in the Nation from the Journal, via Associated Press wirephoto.

Ultimate goal of the 600 North Junior students, however, is to have the design made into a stamp that will be seen by servicemen abroad.

In a letter to Mr. O'Brien, Robert M. Shockley, geography teacher at the school, said:

"Since the most prized possession of American servicemen is a letter from home, we know American fighting men would be most appreciative if their letters from home came with a U.S. postage stamp showing American gratitude."

To become an official stamp, a proposal is given to a citizens' stamp advisory committee, made up of prominent persons and philatelists throughout the United States, who have criteria that a stamp must meet.

OFFICIAL STANDARDS

Official standards are that no living person may be portrayed, the design must be of national appeal, cannot be for fraternal, political, or religious organizations or for commercial enterprise contributions and must not portray cities, towns, or counties.

About 15 commemorative stamps are issued each calendar year, in quantities of approximately 125 million.

It normally takes a year or more to have a design approved, although a stamp honoring the late Adlai Stevenson appeared just 6 months after his death.

"The best bet is to get a Senator or Congressman to get behind the matter, to present it," said Daniel K. Murphy, Sioux City postmaster.

He noted, however, that the issuing of stamps is one area reserved as much as possible for nonpolitical subjects and thought the proposed stamp could become controversial. There is a debate going on in the country over America's part in the Vietnam war—where most servicemen are fighting—and some people will like it and some won't.

GROWS INTO CRUSADE

But the project has almost become a crusade for North Junior students, and there has been a steady flow of letters from them to persons in all parts of the country, asking for support. One class has sent letters to person in 17 States, "to anyone they think might be of help," Mr. Shockley said.

Senators, Congressmen, President Johnson, and former Presidents, television and movie personalties—people in all walks of public life—people in and out of public office—have been contacted. And letters of support are now returning, he said

Within the city, support has come from other schools. Larry Reese, campaigning for student body president at Central High School, has made the project an election platform, say he will call on the students there and at other city schools to back it.

Chleo J. Weins, North Junior principal, and Tillie Luitgens, dean, have taken the matter to meetings with respective officials of other schools aid have received promises of help.

"This thing is just beginning to start," Mr. Schockley said. "Future moves may include a petition drive," he added.

Missing Atomic Reactor Parts and Pieces Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am making a report to the House GOP conference which may be of interest to others as well. Although the report discusses only certain nuclear reactor power station components, it is understood that considerable additional AID supplies for India are similarly missing. The report follows:

MYSTERY OF THE MISSING TARAPUR REACTOR PARTS AND PIECES

At Tarapur, India, a fine nuclear power station is being built costing over $100 million. Of this sum $80 million is being supplied by U.S. taxpayers via the Agency for International Development.

Early last September when the war between India and Pakistan broke out several hundred thousand dollars worth of parts and pieces for the Tarapur reactor where in the hold of a ship bound for India. The ship happened to be in a Pakistani port when hostilities commenced.

The Government of Pakistan immediately siezed this cargo which consisted of a 20-ton airlock and precisely formed pieces of sheet steel. These were prefabricated components of the reactor containment vessel without which it could not be completed. The cargo was removed from the ship by the Pakistan Government to a place unknown.

AID and the State Department both were notified promptly of the situation. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy requested that every effort be made to obtain release of this property. It was given assurance by the Secretary of State that such efforts were being made. For week after week no results were obtained. The U.S. contractor involved (General Electric) eventually became discouraged and in order to avoid interminable delay in completing the reactor—and consequent heavy financial losses—ordered replacements fabricated and shipped from the United States all the way to India.

The original parts and pieces are still somewhere in Pakistan still being held by that Government. Apparently neither the State Department, AID, the contractor, or anybody else outside of Pakistan has the remotest notion where they are even today.

Nevertheless, since the seizure, not only has President Johnson entertained the Prime Minister of Pakistan at the White House, but on January 19 AID saw fit to make a loan to Pakistan, making $8.2 million American money available to that Government to assist in construction of the Mangla Dam and 100,000-kilowatt power station in West Pakistan. (The Tarapur reactor's initial power is scheduled at 380,000 kilowatts.)

It is difficult to formulate a moderate comment regarding this course of events, therefore, I am not attempting to do so.

Ninetieth Birthday of Speaker Rainey's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 1933, my friend and fellow Illinoisan, the Honorable Henry Thomas Rainey, was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. He filled with honor and distinction that high office for less than a year and a half, dying on August 19, 1934.

I am reminded of all this, and of the great pride we in Illinois experienced at the election of Congressman Rainey to the Speakership, by the receipt of a copy of the Times-Echo of Eureka Springs, Ark., with a featured news article on the 90th birthday of the Honorable Claude Albert Fuller, Member of the 71st and the four succeeding Congresses.

Claude Albert Fuller was born in Prophetstown, Whiteside County, Ill., and, while as a small lad he went to Arkansas with his parents, he never forgot that he was a native son of Illinois. The part he played in the election of Speaker Rainey 33 years ago and how later he cashed in on much beneficial legislation for Arkansas is told in the following excerpts from the article in the Eureka Springs Times-Echo of January 20, 1966:

"Mr. Fuller came to Eureka Springs at the age of nine with his parents.

Graduating from the Eureka Springs High School in 1896, he went on to law school in Chicago, returning home in 1898 to be admitted to practice at the bar.

In 1928 Mr. Fuller was elected to Congress from the Third District and served his country in that position until 1939. He conducted the campaign to elect Rainey as Speaker, and was named to the powerful Ways and Means Committee, holding over under Speakers Byrns and Bankhead.

In Congress Mr. Fuller was the father of the White River program of flood control and development of hydroelectric power. He introduced the first bill which included Norfolk and other dams to follow. With just the completion of Beaver Dam just above his old farm, he lived to see the completion of that dream.

He secured new post office buildings for Berryville, Bentonville, and Siloam Springs, the Veterans Hospital at Fayetteville, secured funds for schools and roads.

He purchased both the Crescent and Basin Park Hotels in the 1920's and rehabilitated them. He is at present owner of the Basin Park Hotel and president of the Eureka Springs Bank.

Mr. Speaker on behalf of myself and others in Illinois who knew and admired Speaker Rainey, and his good wife, who worked by his side, throughout the years, I extend heartiest congratulations and good wishes to this stalwart young veteran of Arkansas on his 90th birthday.

Publisher Carl Estes of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Dallas News concerning one of the most outstanding men and publishers in our Nation, Publisher Carl Estes of the Longview Daily News.

EAST TEXAS' ESTES

In East Texas, New Year's Day came in with a monumental edition of the Longview Morning Journal—566 pages chock-full of information about the past, present, and potential of that prospering, growing region and city.

"Opportunity Land," title of the front-page editorial, aptly describes the area, industrial developments, new lakes and other tourist attractions, over 33,000 jobs in Gregg County, alone, plans for navigation of the Sabine River are but a few of the hundreds of evidences of opportunity developed or developing from the Louisiana boundary to the doorsteps of Dallas.

Key figure in many of these advancements today, as he has been for many years, is Carl Estes, publisher of the Longview newspapers. Aided by an able staff, he produces a January 1 edition each year that is the envy of fellow publishers and a keepsake for historians, business analysts, and others.

His 1966 achievement not only is the finest yet, but a newspaper to challenge the best efforts of everyone in the future. And everyone includes not only the staff of the Longview Morning Journal, but newspapermen from California to the Carolinas.

Massive changes have taken place in East Texas. Hills that once ran red with water eroding betweens rows of corn and cotton now are brightened by the crimson of clover grazed by beef and dairy herds. Where mules not long ago turned syrup mills now stand plants turning out huge machines, beer and containers to put it in, to mention only a few.

"The foundations are laid and new walls of progress are going up in the mighty Sabine-Cypress inland empire," comments our neighbor to the east of Dallas. This city and newspaper heartily concur and proudly team up with East Texans to help build those foundations and walls.

Warren A. Seavey of Harvard Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the world of law and humanity itself is poorer today for the loss of Warren A. Seavey. By the same token all men are richer because of the contributions of his life. He worshiped reason and smashed idols. As a teacher, his field was law, torts, agency. More important he taught young men to think. To have him as an instructor was to get a glimpse—perhaps a clear one—of what it was like to have known Socrates. I submit herewith the New York Times obituary of this departed friend:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 19, 1966]

WARREN A. SEAVEY OF HARVARD LAW—RETIRED PROFESSOR, EXPERT ON TORTS, DIES AT 85

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., January 18.—Warren Abner Seavey, Bussey Professor of Law Emeritus at Harvard University, died today of a heart attack in Weston, where he made his home. He was 85 years old.

Dr. Seavey was an authority on the law of torts, agency, equity, judgments, and restitution. Wide teaching experience abroad as well as in this country had also made him something of an authority on international affairs.

In November 1944 he headed a group of Harvard professors who asked the War Department to give German prisoners of war "a full education on the ideals of democracy." The department rejected the suggestion as "unworkable."

In the days before the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Professor Seavey wrote to the newspapers on many occasions warning of the growing danger in the Far East. In October 1940, he wrote to the New York Times, "If we act now and destroy the economic stability of Japan, by complete embargo and by aid to China, we have little to fear." On October 14, 1941, he wrote, "It has been our past failures to speak clearly which have led Japan on." And of the appointment of Adm. Kichisaburo Nomura as Japanese Ambassador to Washington he said, "While Nomura smiles and placates, the (Japanese) army and navy poise to spring."

He was born in Boston, took his A.B. and LL.B. at Harvard. After starting in law practice in Boston, he became a professor of law at the Imperial Pei Yang University, Tientsin, China. Later he taught at Harvard, Oklahoma State, Tulane, and Indiana Universities.

He was dean of the Nebraska University College of Law from 1920 to 1926, and professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania in 1926–27. He was appointed to Harvard Law School from the Pennsylvania post, and served until 1955.

Professor Seavey wrote "Cases on Agency," "Cases on Equity," "Restatement of Restitution," "Restatement of Torts," "Cases on Torts," and other books pertaining to those branches of law.

A captain of infantry in World War I, he directed the College of Law of the American Expeditionary Forces, in Beaune, France, in 1919. In 1947 he was president of the Association of American Law Schools.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Stella Crowell Seavey; a son, Robert; a daughter, Mrs. Allan M. Cormack; and eight grandchildren. There will be a funeral for him in Memorial Church in Harvard Yard at 4 p.m. on Monday.

Firemen Necessary on Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARNOLD OLSEN

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an ad in the Washington Daily News, Wednesday, January 19, 1966. This ad was inserted by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen under the enlightened presidency of H. E. Gilbert. The article contains very interesting information concerning the train accident increase which has occurred since the layoff of firemen. I hope that my colleagues will give necessary attention to this ad:

WHY DO THE RAILROADS FEAR A REAL FACT-FINDING STUDY OF OPERATIONS WITH AND WITHOUT HELPERS (FIREMEN)?

The railroads have prevented any valid joint study of the increase in train accidents, the decrease in railroad efficiency, and the loading of extra work and hazards on other employees since the removal of locomotive helpers (firemen).

Obviously the railroads do not want the public and Congress to know that, without helpers (firemen)—

Train accidents in 1964 increased an average of 24 percent over 1961, 1962, 1963—an increase the Chairman of the ICC called alarming.

On-duty deaths and injuries increased 10 percent among railroad operating employees (engineers, conductors, breakemen, etc.)—the group most affected by the fireman-off ruling.

Many accidents were not reported to the ICC by railroad managements.

Railroad efficiency declined, as evidenced by a decrease in average freight train speed—a reversal of a longtime trend of faster train speeds.

Supervisors and other employees were assigned to do firemen's work in an attempt to hold down accidents and boost efficiency.

Locomotive engineers, nationwide describe their job as more hazardous and more burdensome without helpers (firemen) in locomotive cabs.

THE JOINT BOARD HOAX

The National Joint Board, created to study the effect of the firemen-off ruling, never investigated the increase in train accidents nor the decline in railroad efficiency. In fact, it never made any joint labor-management study of any factor related to the fireman issue. The truth is, it never functioned as a joint board in any sense even though it was charged with conducting "a continuing and intensive study of railroad operations with and without firemen."

Instead of agreeing to a full and open investigation, the railroads, with the help of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, used the Joint Board as a self-serving propaganda vehicle. The Board's "report" was based almost completely on secret management-controlled surveys, secret management-directed studies. The report itself was management written and signed only by management members and an officer of a union representing less than 5 percent of all helpers (firemen). The railroads' attempt to pass off this report in the Nation's press as "a beacon of truth" is an insult to the intelligence of the Members of Congress, the American public and, above all, the perceptive leaders of the railroad industry.

Obviously, the railroads will not permit a penetrating study of what has happened since the removal of railroad firemen.

The reason: they are afraid of the results.

Urban Renewal and Property Acquisition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, lengthy delay in acquiring property under urban renewal projects has resulted in considerable hardship to many property owners. The following is a resolution adopted by the Detroit Common Council pursuant to this matter:

DETROIT, MICH.,
January 21, 1966.

Pursuant to action of the common council, the following resolution by Councilman Miriani was unanimously adopted by that body on January 18, 1966, and is herewith forwarded to you for your favorable consideration:

"Whereas the Common Council of the City of Detroit has long been concerned about hardships caused some property owners as a result of lengthy delays in acquiring property in urban renewal projects; and

"Whereas the following are typical examples of cases in which early acquisition might alleviate undue hardship:

"1. Because of a heart condition, a man must move immediately into a home with all rooms on the first floor.

"2. The owner of an apartment building loses tenants and income because of impending urban renewal.

"3. A retired couple now living in Florida can no longer attract tentants and have difficulty in protecting their vacant home from vandals.

"4. A small market on the fringe of an urban renewal area loses a large percentage of its trade and must operate at a loss until it is acquired as a part of another project.

"5. A family wishes to purchase a new home and must use the equity in their present home for a downpayment.

"6. A flourishing business wishes to relocate but needs the time and money which would be afforded by early acquisition in order to transfer operations without serious loss.

"7. A widow receiving Aid of Dependent Children can no longer afford to maintain her house. She desires early acquisition so that she can move to an apartment.

"8. A family wishes to sell a vacant house which is part of an estate being diminished by taxes and insurance, and

"Whereas people occupying property in urban renewal areas frequently must forgo opportunities to purchase other homes because of this delay; and

"Whereas vacant property is frequently vandalized during the delay, causing substantial financial loss to the owners when the property is finally acquired; and

"Whereas the existing procedures for early acquisition of property in urban renewal projects are unwieldy and do not lend themselves to the alleviation of the hardships; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Department of Housing and Urban Development is urged to develop procedures whereby funds for early acquisition of property in hardship cases can be receievd by the local community at the same time planning funds are made available upon the approval by the Department of Housing and Urban Development of the survey and planning application for an urban renewal project."

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS D. LEADBETTER,
City Clerk.

In the Circle: Carl Albert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the January issue of Washington World magazine contains an article describing the talents and the achievements of CARL ALBERT as majority leader. This article recognizes his significant contribution to the record of the 89th Congress and also includes an analysis of his concept of the high role of the legislative branch of our Government. I am certain many Members will share my interest in this appropriate tribute to his work, which I will enter herewith in full:

IN THE CIRCLE: CARL ALBERT

In the 1st session of the 89th Congress, in a period of 174 days of legislative activity, of 469 proposals submitted by the President of the United States to the Congress, 321 were approved representing a batting average for the Johnson administration of 68.4 percent.

Many political spokesmen have pondered the reasons for this spectacular achievement by the President. The Congress has been called a rubberstamp to the will of an imperious Executive. The Congress has been termed "responsive" for the first time in years to the will of the people. Somewhere between these theories is the fact of the matter.

One of these "facts" is the presence on the scene of Democratic majority leader of the House of Representatives, the Honorable CARL ALBERT, of McAlester, Okla. ALBERT is the leader of the largest one-party majority since 1936. The task of the majority leader is to map strategy to fulfill the party's goals in any given legislative session. What the task has boiled down to through the years is the acceptance of a legislative platform from the titular head of the party—in Mr. ALBERT's case, normally the White House incumbent—and wielding the use of power, office, personality, and human relations to unite the diverse elements of his party to insure unity on any given issue.

To accomplish this task, the majority leader, working with the Speaker, wields the tremendous informal and formal influence on House procedure, protocol, patronage, and the inevitable opportunity for the chosen few to share the spotlight of national attention. In using this power, the leader must share it wisely with the chairmen of the House standing committees, traditional prima donnas in their own right, and somehow balance out to answer positively the demands of the White House.

It is sheer nonsense to believe that the 295 Democrats in the House simply gave a "yes" vote to Mr. Johnson's every whim. It is not nonsense to say that, among the 71 freshmen Democrat Representatives, the average of support for the Great Society's legislative program was 89 percent on 12 key rollcalls and 83 percent on 66 rollcalls through early August 1965 (source, Congressional Quarterly). Such support might represent a case of knowing where one's bread is buttered; or, it might be that the freshmen elected in the Johnson landslide were truly of the Great Society cloth. At any rate, someone had to be able to mobilize this support among the freshmen as well as to hold in line the sizable number of incumbent Democrats conscious of their prerogatives as House regulars. Most commentators on the Capitol Hill scene believe that the genius who came into his own in delivering the Johnson majorities was CARL ALBERT, a man far opposite from Johnson in public image or personality.

In contrasting the years of the Johnson administration to that of the Kennedys, observers believe that a partial answer to the ease with which the Great Society passed through the Houses of Congress rests in the shrewd use of House leadership by the President.

Someone, however, had to be there for the President to utilize. Someone had to grease the wheels, as it were. Someone had to be aware of the thousand nuances of House personalities; had to know the House as Lyndon Johnson knew the Senate in his days of leadership in the Upper Chamber. Speaker MCCORMACK, a gentleman of the old school, has respect and admiration from many of his colleagues. He is not basically the same student of personalities and of procedure—the combination that make a great House leader—as was Sam Rayburn or, for that matter, his predecessor on the other side of the aisle, JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts.

The signs all point to the gentleman from Oklahoma as the man who delivered for L.B.J. Why?

CARL ALBERT is a professional politician. He revels in the word "politician" from its classic meaning of involvement in people to its idiomatic use in our day with overtones of power and influence—of people and bosses. CARL ALBERT is a total unity as a politician. His background, his formal training, his personality bring a unity of heart and mind, into the play of the political arena.

As an astute scholar of the legislative scene—he wrote a brilliant scholastic record in his major of government at the University of Oklahoma and went on to academic achievement as a Rhodes Scholar obtaining two law degrees at venerable Oxford University, the ultimate in academic respectability for any American (Harvard notwithstanding)—CARL ALBERT understands the many sides of government by the people.

As a man, CARL ALBERT has a reputation of intense integrity among his colleagues. He is introspective in mien. He is not a "hail-fellow-well-met" who must be rewarded constantly by the smile of his companions to survive. In short, he is a man who knows himself, understands his life, and realizes to the *n*th degree what he is doing and where he is going.

As a man who knows politics, CARL ALBERT respects loyalty. He recognizes that many a potential great in politics falls by the wayside because he does not understand the process of loyalty, of respectable compromise to insure such loyalty, and the necessity of give and take; the art of the favor and gift of bestowing. The man who cannot come to grips with such can never be truly a master of our system of government. The man who can advance the party is the man who can control—who can direct the individual loyalties and build them into a workable majority. Carl Albert recalls the attention given him by Speaker Sam Rayburn and by then Majority Leader John McCormack. He also recalls the union at an early date with the Johnson destinies. From his appointment in 1955 as party whip, Albert has been preparing for the role he plays today.

Albert is a realist even as he is a rationalist. From these standpoints, he is a natural for a Speaker of the House. From the personal standpoint, no man committed to legislative government could avoid the thrill in anticipating the position as Speaker. Difficult to understand on the part on of an outsider, to the dedicated Member of the House the position of Speaker is all that the Presidency implies. Certainly Albert realizes that he is one on whom the light may shine.

Such a view of the Speaker, gives further insight into Albert's dedication to the legislative success of the Johnson program. Albert is an avid and totally committed legislator. His experience and education have pointed him toward this area of government. First elected to Congress in 1946, Albert has been returned to Washington by his loyal constituents for 17 years. After four terms, Members of the House inevitably begin to view themselves as "clubbers." They become immersed beings. To the country at large, this is mere semantics. To the Washington dweller, characterizing a Congressman as a "clubber" simply means that this Representative is committed to a "life term" in the House and regards it as the first step of heaven.

Albert himself terms his own romance with the House as being set in the ways of the Chamber. He readily confesses that to him the House of Representatives is the embodiment of the people's part in their Government. He quotes unashamedly and with zeal the words of Alexander Hamilton that the House is "where the people truly rule."

Albert believes the House is the one area or government where the people have direct and constant control. To him here is government of, by, and for the people, where the people can direct and control it through the frequency and regularity of elections.

In his understanding of the integrity of the House, he regards it as the absolute balance point between the other spheres of government because it does reflect the will of the people.

In accepting Albert's analysis of the House and in his involvement in its mystique, one then faces the problem of reconciling the "rubberstamp" epitaph of the 89th Congress and Lyndon Johnson.

Questioning Albert on this point evokes an angry response from this taciturn man whose short stature belies the height of his fervor when aroused. Albert maintains that the program approved by the 89th Congress reflected the mood and temper of its Members and not the strength of any one man. He insists that neither the executive branch nor the judicial have usurped the power of the legislative. He maintains that each measure of the Great Society was developed in the Congress and not in the executive branch of the Government.

Perhaps the truth of the matter lies in Albert's evaluation of President Johnson's role in the successful parts of the Great Society's program. Albert views the President as first and always a legislator—steeped in the traditions and the procedures of the legislative branch. He terms him the most skillful legislative tactician in our century.

The inference is obvious that such a President would know how to develop and obtain passage of his programs. Certainly, any student would accept Albert's view of President Johnson. Whether or not every measure of the Great Society was written in the legislative or executive branch is not determined. It is important to the continuing integrity of this branch, that its majority leader is willing to vocally insist on its prerogatives.

In large measure Great Society programs have been enacted into law. The ability of Carl Albert was a key here and the little attention he attracted in the last session, is a tribute to his wisdom and understanding of his Chamber and its Members. Certainly, the Republican Party has no legislative strategist of dual caliber on the scene and it suffers accordingly.

In forecasting the second session of the 89th Congress, observers will watch Carl Albert to see what is ahead. With its measures law, the Great Society now faces the problems of administering, in some cases even creating, and certainly of funding its specific programs. It was one success to obtain approval of these measures; it may be another to obtain funds. At any rate, here will be a real test of Albert's ability to undergird his President's ideas with necessary cash.

In the days ahead for the Congress and its continuing role in our ever-evolving democracy, Carl Albert will be a strong and central figure on the legislative stage for at least the next 15 years. In fulfilling his view of Congress as the instrument of the people, Carl Albert's philosophy of legislative government will be important to the America of the future. As he puts it, "Congress is an agency for accommodation and compromise, bringing public thinking into consensus. To be successful, Congress must act within the realm of public support. In building this support Congress must continue to be a broker of new ideas and be a partner with every aspect of our community life."

In bringing together the consensus which is the Great Society, Carl Albert is achieving his ideal of government by the people.

Mrs. Tom C. Gooch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the Congressional Record some articles that appeared in connection with the passing of Mrs. Tom C. Gooch, of Dallas, Tex. I knew Mrs. Gooch and her late husband, Publisher Tom Gooch. They were very outstanding in many, many ways. The people of Texas forever shall miss them both.

Mrs. Tom C. Gooch Dies—Culture Benefactor

Mrs. Tom C. Gooch, widow of a former publisher of the Dallas Times Herald, died in a Dallas hospital Sunday after a long illness.

The 82-year-old resident of 3724 Armstrong left a gentle but distinctive imprint on Dallas.

She was not only a benefactor of cultural ventures but an active participant. For a time, in her youth, she was a violinist with the Dallas Symphony Orchestra.

Last May she was awarded an honorary doctorate in humanities from Southern Methodist University. She was a well-known supporter of SMU. The Gooch family gave the university a journalism scholarship.

Two weeks ago when a Dallas elementary school was named after her husband, Mrs. Gooch gave the school a grand piano, a color TV set and a portrait of her husband, publisher of the Times Herald from 1941 to 1952.

She was an honorary director of the Dallas Art Association, and a member of the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts League and the Dallas Woman's Club.

Many of her philanthropies were quietly done. She helped a number of young authors and artists. She was an important supporter of the Christ Child, an organization established to assist children of the poor.

Her voice was often heard favoring beautification projects in Dallas. She was a member of Highland Park Methodist Church.

She was 11 years old when she came to Dallas with her family. She had been born, Lula Flateau, in Pittsburg, Camp County. Her mother was the daughter of Maj. William Harrison Pitts, founder of that east Texas town.

Her father was Capt. Louis Falteau, a former steamboat skipper and son of a pioneer Texas couple.

In 1908, she was married to Thomas Carbry Gooch, the son of a buffalo hunter who, as an artist and writer, was already attracting attention in journalism circles.

Mr. and Mrs. Gooch had no children. She is survived by two sisters, Mrs. George Clifton Long, of Hartford, Conn., and Mrs. Eugene D. Nims, of St. Louis, and several nieces and nephews.

Funeral arrangements were pending Sunday night at Sparkman's Funeral Home, 2115 Ross.

[From the Dallas News, Dec. 1, 1965]

Mrs. Tom C. Gooch

Dallas mourns the death, at 82, of Mrs. Tom C. Gooch, whose influence and contribution to the life of city and area have been notable for more than half a century. Her interests covered a wide range of activities in educational, cultural, and philanthropic fields.

The former Lula Flateau was a granddaughter of Maj. William Harrison Pitts, founder of the east Texas city of Pittsburg. Her father was Capt. Louis Flateau, former steamboat captain and son of a pioneer Texas couple. She was married in 1908 to Tom Carbry Gooch, longtime Dallas and Texas newspaper writer, editor, and publisher of the Dallas Times Herald at his death in 1952.

Mrs. Gooch was an honorary life member of the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, on whose board she served for more than 40 years. She was a patron of the Dallas Art Association, and a member of the Dallas Woman's Club and the Daughters of the Republic of Texas.

Her interest in music dated from the early days of the Dallas Symphony Orchestra, in which as a girl she played the violin. With her husband, she was greately interested in the development of Southern Methodist University and the Southwestern Medical Foundation.

At SMU's commencement exercises last spring Mrs. Gooch received an honorary degree of doctor of humanities, a fitting honor of her personal achievements in which the whole community concurred.

Mrs. Tom Gooch Labored on Roses

In a wide-brim hat, garden dress, and gloves, Mrs. Tom C. Gooch was a familiar figure among the rose bushes at her home, 3724 Armstrong Avenue.

Her flowers provided a seasonal show of bloom for passersby.

Before leaving her home for Dallas Medical and Surgical Clinic when she became ill on October 30, she spoke to Troy White, the man who had driven her auto for many years.

"Take good care of my flowers," she urged.

Mrs. Gooch, widow of a former publisher of the Dallas Times-Herald, died Sunday in the hospital.

From the time of her husband's death on June 13, 1962, Mrs. Gooch focused her energies and gifts on two important Dallas institutions. They were Southern Methodist University and the Southwestern Medical Foundation, whose growth, welfare, and public service had been Mr. Gooch's interest and concern for many years.

At the top of her personal list of organizations, charities, and good causes—numbering more than 50 through the years—was the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts. She was a member of the board of directors for more than 40 years, an honorary life member and a major patron from its founding days.

As a girl, she played violin in the Dallas Symphony Orchestra and the orchestra held her deep personal affection as a vital force in the growth of the cultural life of Dallas.

Mrs. Gooch, a lifelong Methodist, in recent years spent her Sundays before a television set following televised religious services.

She was a charter member of the Dallas Woman's Club and was a member of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas.

Of her many honors, the honorary doctor of humanities degree, awarded her at commencement ceremonies this year at Southern Methodist University, perhaps touched her most deeply.

Her illness prevented her attending the November 13 dedication of the Tom C. Gooch Elementary School in Dallas. During this ceremony, an oil portrait of Tom Gooch which had hung in her drawing room was unveiled at the school. The portrait was given by Mrs. Gooch in addition to her own grand piano and a television set.

She loved to fish in Little Sandy Lake near Hawkins in Wood County. This summer she went on three fishing expeditions to the lake, just across the road from the farm where she and Mr. Gooch spent their summers in the old days.

The farm is in east Texas forests where her pioneer ancestors had hunted and where—according to family lore—her grandfather killed a deer on his 80th birthday.

Mrs. Gooch enjoyed her home, her flowers, her neighbors, and old friends. After the death of Tom Gooch, she never left Dallas except for the brief summer excursions to east Texas.

Resolution Providing for Brumidi Bust Gains Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the overwhelming response of my colleagues who have joined me in introducing identical concurrent resolutions urging the House of Representatives to authorize the expenditure of $2,500 in order that a bust of Constantino Brumidi may be placed in the Capitol.

I have received many letters from my colleagues advising me of their wholehearted support in this effort to bestow recognition on Constantino Brumidi. It is my pleasure to insert these letters in the Appendix of the Record.

My heart is filled with joy and gratitude at this encouraging response and I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to all of you who have pledged support for this long overdue recognition of Brumidi.

I have talked with the distinguished chairman of the House Administration Committee, Hon. Omar Burleson, of Texas, and he has assured me that the subcommittee of the House Administration Committee, which is chaired by the Honorable Paul C. Jones of Missouri, will hold hearings on this legislation as soon as possible. I am certain that the members of the House Administration Subcommittee, as well as the House Administration Committee, after reviewing all the facts, will unanimously approve this worthwhile endeavor.

Once again, I thank all of my colleagues for their enthusiastic support of this resolution. Your active efforts will insure its early enactment.

The letters from my colleagues follow:

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman: I have your letter of January 12, and its enclosures—a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 which you have introduced to authorize procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for placement in the Nation's Capitol and your press release on this matter.

I share your concern that this talented artist, who contributed so much to the beauty of the U.S. Capitol, be honored in a fitting manner, and I will be pleased to give House Concurrent Resolution 531 every consideration when it comes to the floor of the House of Representatives for action.

Sincerely yours,
Edna F. Kelly.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Just a short note to tell you that I am more than happy to be able to introduce an identical resolution such as House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I have this day put it into the hopper and shall look forward to receiving my confirmation copies.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
John H. Dent,
Member of Congress.

House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Following your note about Brumidi, I will introduce a like resolution. This is mainly because I admire Congressman Annunzio just about as much as I do Artist Brumidi.

Yours,
John G. Dow.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.
The Honorable Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Pursuant to the excellent suggestion made in your recent letter, I have on January 18 introduced a concurrent resolution which is identical with your House Concurrent Resolution 531.

My bill is known as House Concurrent Resolution 544.

Please be assured of my continued support to obtain passage of this legislation which will bring due recognition, however belated it may be, to Artist Constantino Brumidi, "Citizen of the United States."

Aloha and best wishes.
Sincerely,
Spark M. Matsunaga,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for contacting me with reference to your proposal that a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi be placed in the Capitol.

I'm for your bill wholeheartedly.

With kind regards, I am,
Sincerely,
E. C. Gathings.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Thank you for your letter and copy of your resolution to honor Brumidi.

I appreciate your sending me this resolution, and I will introduce it shortly.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Paul A. Fino,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Suite 1429, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and enclosed copy of your resolution, which would authorize the procurement of a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for placement in the Nation's Capitol.

I am happy to inform you that I have today introduced a similar resolution, and I hope this legislation will be enacted during this session of the 89th Congress.

With warm personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
William T. Murphy,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 19, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building.

Dear Frank: I thought you might be interested in knowing that today I introduced in the House a concurrent resolution identical to House Concurrent Resolution 531 which you introduced on January 12.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
John N. Erlenborn,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for calling my attention to House Concurrent Resolution 531. You have done well in securing recognition for an outstanding artist and a great American.

I am proud to support you in giving this well deserved recognition.

Cordially and sincerely,
Barratt O'Hara,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I appreciate your writing me with reference to your House Concurrent Resolution 531 which would recognize the outstanding artist and great American, Constantino Brumidi.

As you know, this legislation is pending before the House Administration Committee, of which I am a member. It certainly shall have my support and vote.

Sincerely,

Sam M. Gibbons,
U.S. Congressman.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 21, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I am happy to join with you in this long overdue tribute to Constantino Brumidi and will put my bill in next week.

Kind personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

John M. Murphy,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for sending me your resolution and information on Constantino Brumidi.

I support your resolution, and will vote for it when it comes before the House.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

Donald M. Fraser.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: It is my pleasure to introduce a bill identical to your House Concurrent Resolution 531 giving recognition to Constantino Brumidi.

Be assured of my support in securing passage of this resolution.

Very truly yours,

Robert L. Leggett,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: This is in reference to your letter of January 12. I will be glad to support House Concurrent Resolution 531, to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed on the first floor of the Senate wing of the Capitol.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Richard Bolling.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I appreciated receiving your letter of January 12, 1966, and I will support you in your efforts.

I am asking my staff to prepare an identical resolution, and I will plan to introduce it in the near future.

With best regards.

Yours very truly,

Brock Adams,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I'm all for you. Count on my support for House Concurrent Resolution 531.

Donald Rumsfeld,
Representative in Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Member of Congress.
1429 Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: I want to thank you for your letter of January 12, 1966, with reference to House Concurrent Resolution 531 to provide a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi for the Capitol.

I agree with you that Brumidi should have a place of honor in the Capitol. I am happy to join with you in introducing legislation to provide a suitable bust for the Capitol of this great Italo-American artist.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Basil L. Whitener,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and enclosure, House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I shall be very happy to introduce an identical concurrent resolution in the very near future.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

T. J. Dulski.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 15, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC

Dear Frank: It will be an honor and a pleasure for me to introduce your bill relating to the distinguished artist, Constantino Brumidi.

I plan to do so next week.

Sincerely,

Wm. Jennings Bryan Dorn,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: I acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 12 and enclosures concerning House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I shall be glad to support your proposal to provide proper recognition to Constantino Brumidi.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Monagan,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Thank you for your letter of January 12 and the enclosed copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531.

I am pleased to advise you that I have today introduced a similar House concurrent resolution.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

Bill.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: I congratulate you upon your introduction of the resolution to provide a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi to be placed in the Capitol.

This should have prompt approval by the Congress and I am glad to join in introducing a similar resolution.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Bob Sikes.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 17, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
U.S. House of Representatives, Room 1429,
Longsworth Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Colleague: Thank you kindly for your recent letter enclosing a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 and your press release on it.

I am pleased to advise I have today introduced a bill identical to yours and want you to know I will support this legislation and lend any assistance I can to get prompt action.

I appreciate your contacting me on this matter and will be happy to cooperate in every way I can.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Kenneth J. Gray,
U.S. Congressman.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Enclosed please find a copy of the House concurrent resolution which I introduced.

I think this is a fine thought and a very appropriate gesture at this time.

Yours very truly,

Brock Adams,
Member of Congress.

Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.
Hon. Frank Annunzio,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Frank: Appreciated receiving your letter of January 12, enclosing a copy of House Concurrent Resolution 531 and your release. I believe your idea is certainly a good one, with considerable merit, and you may be sure I'll do what I can to help.

Meanwhile, with kindest best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Jack Brooks,
Member of Congress.

Polish People Became United as a Nation a Thousand Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the year 1966 marks the 1,000th anniversary, or millennium, of Christianity in Poland. Some 30 million Poles in Poland, and some 12 million others of Polish descent throughout the world, will celebrate this memorable milestone in the history of a great nation.

The important role played by Polish-Americans in the history of the United States is too well known to need documentation. The recent appointment of the distinguished John A. Gronouski as our Ambassador to Warsaw typifies the many key positions held in the United States by Americans of Polish ancestry. The Warsaw assignment has taken on deeper significance in recent months, since it has been openly acknowledged that this is our unofficial contact with Red China.

The thousands of Polish-Americans in my congressional district are joining with their fellow Poles everywhere in observance of the millennium this year.

An article in the January 13 edition of the Dearborn Heights Journal, published in my district, exemplifies the pride which the Polish people feel on this historic anniversary. This article, written by Mr. Robert Selwa, himself a Polish-American, is a well-written and moving tribute to one of the oldest of the Christian nations. For this reason, I ask to have it read into the Congressional Record, and brought to the attention of my colleagues and to all Americans:

[From the Dearborn Heights (Mich.) Journal, Jan. 13, 1966]

Millennium 966–1966—Polish People Became United as a Nation a Thousand Years Ago

(By Robert Selwa)

"Poland is not yet lost," the Polish National Anthem states. "While we live she is existing, Poland is not fallen * * *

"Poland shall the foe enslave thee sadly and forever; and we hesitate to save thee? Never, Poland, never."

The Polish National Anthem was written in 1797 when the country was partitioned by its more powerful neighbors, Russia, Prussia, and Austria. Today, with Poland again under the domination of foreigners, the words are just as applicable.

Following World War I, Poland emerged as a nation in its own right. The brave resistance of the Polish people to the Nazis during World War II and to the Russians today give reason to believe that Poland will once again emerge as an independent state.

The Polish people became united exactly 1,000 years ago when Duke Mieszko married the Catholic princess Dabrowka, daughter of King Boleslaw of Bohemia.

Mieszko became a king and converted to catholicism. He agreed with Rome to establish a Catholic mission in Poland. Since then, Poland has been a Catholic nation of its own status in the world.

During those 1,000 years the Polish people fought off invaders from east and west, established centers of learning, and developed a spirit and a culture of its own.

The University of Krakow was established and served as one of the beacons of thought and culture during the Middle Ages.

But the Polish people remained for the most part the hardy peasant folk tending their sheep and their farms that they had always been. Those who migrated to the United States tended to set up farms here.

The Polish, in America as in the home country, are individualists and hard workers who resist any yoke other than that which they undertake themselves.

Rutgers University: 200 Years Old and Virile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1966 one of America's oldest and most respected higher education institutions—Rutgers, the State University, of New Jersey—is celebrating the 200th anniversary of its founding.

Since 1766, when it was called Queens College, Rutgers has educated and trained many thousands of students, who are now leaders in education, industry, science, government and other vital fields. I know that its achievements will be even greater in the future, because it has a fine president in Dr. Mason Gross and a real friend in Gov. Richard J. Hughes.

As a graduate of Rutgers and as the U.S. Representative of the congressional district in which it is located, I submit with pride an editorial from the Courier News, of Plainfield, N.J., entitled, "200 Years Old and Virile."

Two Hundred Years Old and Virile

Rutgers University can look back 200 years to its founding in 1766, but its sights are set today on the future and the potential for growth on the University Heights campus and elsewhere. There is a crying need for New Jersey to respond to its opportunity.

In 3 successive days last week, we witnessed the official opening of Rutgers University bicentennial celebration; we heard Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers, present an exciting picture of the potential of the university, and we reported that the State educational department has proposed a $108 million college construction program for Rutgers and other State colleges to accommodate 18,000 new students by 1970. Governor Hughes is expected to say more about that in his address to the legislature tomorrow.

It will cost money to build the educational facilities and to hire the faculty that New Jersey needs. But we agree with those who see the expense as an investment which will return a profit and pay dividends.

We see that return measured in terms of future undergraduate students staying in New Jersey for their education and continuing here as responsible, self-supporting citizens in a burgeoning economy.

We see business and industry attracted to a State which has facilities for research, an expanding educational program and a continuing source of well-educated employees for a variety of work and specialized services.

The picture ties together in an integrated whole. It does not exist at present. The whole system needs revitalizing, both for quantity of students and for quality of education. But the potential is here.

The Woods Go to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Robert Wood as Under Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development brings to Washington not only one of the ablest men in the field of metropolitan problems today, but his charming wife as well. Peggy Wood has been an active participant in the community life of Lincoln, Mass., where she is the current president of the Lincoln League of Women Voters. No doubt her work there will be missed, but I feel certain that she will find new outlets for her many talents here in Washington.

Under unanimous consent, I include an article by Carol Liston regarding Mrs. Wood, which appeared in the Boston Globe and the Washington Post, in the Congressional Record:

The Woods Go to Washington

(By Carol Liston)

Mrs. Robert C. Wood of Lincoln, whose husband just became Under Secretary for Housing and Urban Development, is enjoying the excitement of her new life.

Suddenly being in the limelight "is fun," according to Margaret Wood, who quickly adds, "I don't want to sound immodest. I don't seek attention. But the last week has been exciting."

A casual woman, who favors tweed skirts and flowered blouses, Mrs. Wood, 34, admits that life in Washington will require some changes.

"I imagine," she says, "life will be more formal, more dressy. I'll find this difficult. But this is just another thing I'll have to master."

So far, there's been no time for adjustment, for Mrs. Wood or her family. She had 2 hours' notice to ready her three children and herself to fly to Washington for her husband's White House swearing in.

As a result, son Frank, 5, was wearing tired brown corduroy pants, with denim knee patches, for the auspicious occasion.

And Mrs. Wood recalls the horror of searching for stockings without runs, and a spotfree outfit for the same trip.

Amid a dozen community commitments, Mr. Wood is trying to get a house in Washington, hopefully in the District. She also is trying to rent her modern home, situated in a woodsy plot off Trapelo Road.

A visit to her house involves catching fleeting bits of conversation while this attractive blonde answers phone calls from friends and the League of Women Voters in Lincoln.

Although her two daughters, Frannie, 10, and Maggie, 7¾ (she insists), are in Lincoln public schools most of the day, Mrs. Wood maintains a hectic pace.

"One night I sat down and counted up all of my activities," she recalls, "and I found I had 11 jobs for 6 organizations."

Such work includes, the board of directors for the local League of Women Voters, presidency of a local cooperative nursery school, soliciting blood donations, charity fund raising, and church choir.

Peg Wood also notes she once held elective office as a trustee of the Bemis Lecture Fund in Lincoln. "One of my jobs then was to make scrambled eggs for Robert Frost, when the fund invited him to read his poetry."

Slowly, she is moving out of her local jobs, to devote her attention to answering congratulatory mail, a task she enjoys.

"I'm going to have a new role, now," she muses. "I decided my own program before. I was more independent. Now my work will be as a wife."

Her first experience as an assistant to her husband came during the press conference, just after he was sworn into office. "I felt so funny. There we were and all I could see were familiar faces from Meet the Press. I felt like waving at them," she recalls.

She did spy a real friend, Saville Davis, chief of the Christian Science Monitor Washington bureau. "He used to live just down the street. So I winked at him."

Washington has a very warm spot in Mrs. Wood's heart, as she met her husband there in 1951, when she was a Radcliffe student and he was with the Bureau of the Budget.

They were married in 1952 and she completed college at George Washington University. Later, in 1954, she received a master's degree from Radcliffe in history.

In 1955, the Woods moved from Cambridge to the house they had built in Lincoln. The switch from suburban living, to city dwelling, is an appealing change to Mrs. Wood.

"I'll like the convenience of city life. And it will be nice not to have to depend on the automobile for every little errand," she says. "And it means the children can be more independent, too."

The girls agree they are going to miss Lincoln and their schoolmates. But the most concerned member of the family is Frank.

His father had promised him a visit to Yellowstone National Park, to see the bears. Now there won't be time for such a visit.

But Frank has agreed he will be satisfied with Washington, if the zoo has a lot of handsome bears.

Understanding Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, juvenile delinquency is a very serious problem about which all of us are very much concerned.

I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent speech on the subject of juvenile delinquency made by a constituent of mine on January 12, 1966, Mr. Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr. The speech was given to the members of the Parent Teachers Association of the Lorton Elementary School, Lorton, Va.

Mr. DelPopolo is certainly an authority on the subject he chose, for he is the assistant superintendent of the D.C. Youth Center at the Lorton Reformatory.

I commend his speech to all for careful attention:

Understanding Juvenile Delinquency

(By Anthony J. DelPopolo, assistant superintendent, D.C. Youth Center, Lorton, Va.)

Juvenile delinquency is a serious social problem today. In fact, it has always existed, but the pattern and number of delinquencies have changed. Even in past generations they were wondering how to cope with this selfsame problem. For example: "Times are not what they used to be. The world must be coming to an end. Children no longer obey their parents." This shrewd observation was discovered on a clay tablet not far from Babylon—over 4,000 years ago.

And how about these words of concern: "Our youth now love luxury, they have bad manners, contempt for authority. They show disrespect for elders and love chatter in place of exercise. Children are now tyrants, not the servants of their households. They no longer rise when elders enter the room. They contradict their parents, chatter before company, gobble up their food and tyrannize their teachers." And so spoke Socrates, the Greek philosopher, in fifth century B.C.

Juvenile delinquency has long been considered an urban slum problem, it has been increasing in suburban, middle- and upper-class areas. The total number of crimes committed by persons in their early teens has increased at an alarming rate. This has caused public interest and indignation throughout our country, as is evident from the coverage of the subject given at meetings such as this. Lengthy articles have been written in the newspapers and magazines. Studies, long and expensive, have been undertaken by private and public universities, by both congressional committees and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Illegal behavior is no small problem, when two major crimes are committed every minute. It is no laughing matter. The annual cost of law enforcement alone is about $4 billion. And what is additionally disturbing crime and delinquency is increasing faster among girls than boys.

Over one million minors are arrested annually, and one-third of these end up as court cases. Does this frighten you? Well, it does me.

I am not here this evening as an expert in the problems of delinquency—in fact, there are none. I am here as one who is interested in the solution of these problems and would like to share with you some of my ideas about the subject.

Just what do we mean by this "juvenile deinquency"? The terms "juvenile" and "delinquency" have varied meanings—dependent upon the point of view in which the term is discussed.

To some people "juvenile" is a dirty word. It frequently refers to small children, as for example when one speaks of "juvenile furniture." However, any relation to childhood is quite distasteful to many an adolescent person: that's something which he asserts he's left for good. Large numbers of adults assume that "juvenile" means delinquent.

"Juveniles" are overgrown, sex-crazed teenagers according to them, who have no respect for authority, are completely without morals, are in fact only one step from becoming full-fledged adult criminals. Small wonder, then, that the label "juvenile" is often resented by those to whom it is applied.

What does juvenile delinquency really mean? In a legal sense juvenile delinquency involves the commission of a minor crime or some serious behavior. The definition of "minor" in regard to crime varies from State to State, but generally it applies to a person over 6 and under 18 years of age. Under the legal definition juvenile delinquency might include habitual truancy, conduct endangering the person or morals of others, infraction of governmental laws and regulations, and uncontrollable disobedience. The delinquency typically displays overtly disrespect for socially accepted values concerning property and persons. He often engages in acts of violence and vandalism.

How about the psychologist? How does he feel about "juvenile delinquency?" To him the legal definition would not do at all. He would only classify antisocial behavior as delinquent behavior only when it is repetitive behavior. Such as, when a child steals again and again; or when he deliberately destroys property or attacks other persons; or if he, over and over again, truants from school or from home; or, if he habitually runs the streets at night in questionable company—these are the delinquents by psychological standards.

There are many people who hold the profession of psychiatry in high esteem. Let's hear what he has to say about delinquency. To the psychiatrist juvenile delinquency may be defined as a child who is hostile, defiant toward authority, whether it be vested in the policeman, the teacher, or the parent. Generally, the child in question is striking against the world for reasons which become apparent as he is studied psychiatrically.

And how about the educator, what does he think of this matter? A superintendent of schools in a southern State notes that juvenile delinquency is a serious type of deviation contrary to law. An incorrigible youth is a delinquent. In like manner, a midwestern educator remarked that delinquency is antisocial behavior outside the pattern of normal misbehavior which is so extreme as to endanger society and the delinquent himself.

And how do you personally feel about the matter? From one point of view many of us did violate some legal statute in a moment of foolishness, daredevilishness, or rebellion. The difference between us and many legally adjusted delinquents lies in the fact that we were fortunate enough not to get caught, or, if caught, were dealt by understanding adults.

May I present to you some facts about delinquency. It will help you understand the problems much better. Young people between the ages of 15 and 17 seem most prone to delinquency. They are more often charged with offenses than the group from 18 to 20. The decrease in the number of delinquencies after age 17 is partly explained by the fact that the children reach the age at which they can leave school and obtain employment. Two to four times as many boys as girls are arrested for delinquent acts. In all, those included in the delinquency statistics account for less than 2 percent of all the children of the United States.

The most frequent offenses by boys are stealing, malicious mischief, and property damage. For girls, ungovernable behavior, running away, and sexual promiscuity top the list. There are three times as many urban cases as rural ones.

These figures cannot be considered conclusive because many children who commit such acts do not come to the attention of the proper authorities. In some cases, children are referred to clinics or sent away to private schools by parents to avoid legal action, and such cases are not counted.

We are all interested in the causes of delinquency. With this in mind—much research is being done—in and out of correctional institutions. However, in the surveys and investigations already made, the results point to one general conclusion—"there is no one single cause of juvenile delinquency."

It is an inaccurate oversimplification to say that delinquency is caused by bad books, bad movies, or bad TV programs, or to say that it is caused by broken homes, working mothers, father absenteeism, inadequate discipline, overcoddling, or lack of religious training, or crowded schools, or slum neighborhoods.

We find that factors such as these have a bearing upon delinquency and many such influences are found in the life histories of individual delinquents. Yet we know by observation that there are nondelinquent children who read bad books, and who have seen bad movies; nondelinquents come from bad homes and from homes with working mothers; nondelinquents who have been coddled, or who have little, if any, religious training, or who were educated in crowded schools, or who lived in a slum neighborhood.

As we look at juvenile delinquency, it does not indicate necessarily a life of later crime. Many who have been apprehended once go on to lead useful lives. There are a multiple of causes of juvenile delinquency, as I have indicated, and these are combined in countless ways in the individual child.

Groups studying juvenile delinquency usually agree that the most frequently occuring factor is the presence of some form of family disorganization. Parents may be separated, and the family disrupted. Some parents may be disinterested in their children, or may not be able themselves to act maturely. In most instances, this means that the child has not received the comfort of parental concern and love, or the discipline noted out with sincerity, fairness, and love in well-adjusted families.

A child may suffer from physical or mental deficiencies, or his basic needs may not be met. If a child feels deprived of love, attention, and recognition, he may express his dissatisfaction or unhappiness in an aggressive, delinquent manner. His actions may express a rejection of his parents, a reaction to his surrounding, an attempt to seek approval of those in his own age group, or an effort to gain attention.

Other causes may be directly related to the unpleasant reality of the youngster's environment. They may include family disharmony, slum environment, poverty, unemployment, racial and class discrimination, lack of adequate education, language difficulties, or any circumstance that produces conflict, tension, and anxieties. Members of social groups that are considered inferior by others will sometimes use antisocial behavior to bolster feelings of inadequacy or inferiority. This is often the case with children who form gangs. These provide both a means of identification and of acceptance.

Children lacking proper home guidance may look to the society or the community for standards. If the society is itself, insecure, is in the process of changing standards, or seems to sanction violence, the child may reflect the confusion he finds.

It must be pointed out, however, that for every juvenile delinquent there is a brother, classmate, or playmate, subjected to identical or similar hardships who never commits a delinquent act and who goes on to become a successful member of the community. There is no adequate answer to explain the differences. Some specialists think that the outcome depends on the determination and ability of the individual to overcome such obstacles.

Another reason children may use delinquent behavior to defy authority or to show their independence is because parents unwittingly sanctioned or encouraged such behavior. The indirect sanctioning occurs in all classes of society.

It seems evident that no child is immune to delinquency, that there is no single cause for it, and that there is no magic formula to prevent it. Society's alertness to the many pitfalls to be avoided can ultimately play a positive role in reducing delinquency.

For the past several minutes we have reviewed juvenile delinquency—its meaning, its causes, and its impact on the American child and American society. And now, what steps can we use to prevent, if we can, or at least to minimize the blow that juvenile delinquency has on our families, our schools, and our community. I believe that the parents, the schools, the church, the community, and all the children themselves have a stake in this prevention.

I believe that the school—

1. Should not be merely an information center and make mimeograph minds, each exactly like the others, but instead should teach the child the thrill of absorbing knowledge, the need of possessing knowledge, the pleasure and satisfaction in the attainment of knowledge.

2. Should not employ teachers who are only teachers 8 hours a day but those whose attitudes, whose ideals, whose activities should gravitate around the fact that they are teachers every waking moment.

3. Should teach children how to think more than what to think.

4. Should teach children as if every day presents a new opportunity to teach them the importance of being oneself—of being an individual.

5. Should accept some of the blame for the pupil who has failed and acted against society because they should have taught him to have avoided that misdeed.

6. Should look at the future of the classroom and its children and use their power to make the children's future brighter and richer in mind and heart.

7. Should be proud for the good job they are doing in directing the future leaders of our Nation.

I believe that parents—

1. Should not become barking Army sergeants, barking orders to their children, but instead guide them to their own perfect examples.

2. Should not treat their erring son or daughter as a criminal but shall remember that he or she is but a chip off the old block.

3. Should not chase the almighty dollar so furiously that they become bears instead of fathers, or workhorses instead of mothers.

4. Should not let their appearance go to pot, nor conduct themselves in such a way that their children become ashamed of them.

5. Should give their children the attention, the love, the understanding they require.

6. Should pray with and for their children morning, noon, and night.

I believe the community—

1. Should accept a major share of what is happening to our young people today.

2. Should provide recreational, cultural, educational facilities to stimulate young people to worthy citizenry.

3. Should provide young people opportunities for community service early in their stage in life.

4. Should provide medical, psychological, and psychiatric facilities for those young people in need of these services.

5. Should provide the type of law enforcement officials and juvenile courts who have a thorough understanding of our growing children.

I believe that the children themselves—

1. Should not look upon their parents and teachers as policemen.

2. Should not use their home as a base of operations from which they go forth for pleasure, but shall wash a dish and mow the lawn now and then.

3. Should remember that someday they will become a parent and consider how they wouldn't like a child who puts furrows in their brows and gray hairs in their heads.

4. Should take counsel from their parents and teachers, for it may be possible they haven't found the answer.

5. Should honor their father and their mother so that the days may be long and happy in the home the parents give them.

I believe that the church—

1. Should use its peculiar skills and meet its mission in preventing delinquency.

2. Should provide spiritual guidance in such a way that young boys and girls reflect God's goodness in all their actions.

3. Should provide time, space, and leadership so that young people may engage in worthwhile activities.

You and I have a choice to make—we can be complacent and let the world and our children travel at an erratic pace, or we can take action both as individuals and as a united group—knowing that delinquency is a social cancer that can destroy the fabric of our society. Either we admit that this problem does not concern each and everyone of us—or it is of the utmost importance to our school, our family, our children, and community, and to the future of our Nation. We must decide whether we shall be concerned with the superficial symptoms of delinquency or with its basic causes * * * and steps toward its prevention. The answer we give—here and now—will have a decisive impact not only upon today—but upon tomorrow—and the day after tomorrow—and the day after that. Your answer and the answer of millions like you to a great extent may be a positive factor in determining the structure and the content of American civilization in the years to come.

New Labyrinth for Banking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, today I filed dissenting views to the majority report of the House Banking and Currency Committee on H.R. 12173, amendments to the Bank Merger Act of 1960. One of the principal reasons why I oppose this bill is that it attempts to substitute for well-defined antitrust standards developed by legislation and case law ever the past 75 years, a vague, undefined standard for the approval of bank mergers which will require years of litigation before anyone will know what this standard really means.

It is interesting to note that an editorial in the New York Times of today, January 24, 1966, entitled "New Labyrinth for Banking" attacks the proposed bill on similar grounds. As the editorial points out:

> The bill threatens to make the merger issue more difficult and confusing rather than cleaner and clearer.

I include a full text of the New York Times editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NEW LABYRINTH FOR BANKING

A bill modifying the standards for bank mergers has been approved by the House Banking and Currency Committee after a heated and highly technical debate. It is of course a compromise, and like most compromises, especially those conceived in haste, it is a grab bag that offers something to everyone with an interest in the proposed legislation.

The banking industry wanted more liberal merger requirements and gets them—in the form of guidelines calling for banking supervisors to consider "the convenience and needs" of the public as well as competitive factors in ruling on mergers. It also wanted action in a hurry because several mergers have been challenged in the courts. It got that too. The banking lobby won exemption for three mergers challenged by the Justice Department that took place before June 1963, when the Supreme Court decided that banks were subject to the antitrust laws and effectively changed banking's ground rules.

The Justice Department lost its fight against modification of the law, but it was tossed a few bones. The most important is that mergers approved by Federal supervisors can still be challenged on antitrust grounds within 30 days; and the Attorney General may bring suit at any time if he decides that a banking merger creates a monopoly. But the bill also offers bank supervisory agencies an opportunity to intervene in court against the Department, a provision reportedly added to win the support of the Comptroller of the Currency.

There is a real need for new ground rules for banking, but it is doubtful that this hasty compromise, which tries to reconcile some justified grievances of the banking industry with the need to protect the public, does the job. By adding to the already complicated and extensive maze of bank regulation, the bill threatens to make the merger issue more difficult and confusing rather than cleaner and clearer. The banking industry professes to be satisfied, yet it may well be more deeply embroiled with more authorities—the supervisory agencies, Justice and the courts—than ever before.

Certainly the proposed legislation will not be the last word on bank mergers. The prospect is that Congress will soon be engaged in modifying its present modifications. It could be in everybody's interest, but especially the public's, if Congress shelved the committee's handiwork and started all over again in an effort to write legislation that had a chance of meeting the test of time.

"Poverty and Postive Thinking"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED REINECKE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, along with many of our colleagues, I have sponsored the Human Investment Act, which will authorize a tax credit to those employers who engage in retraining their employees in needed skills.

Throughout the country, there is being generated an immense amount of support for this legislation, and I was especially happy to note the endorsement given the Human Investment Act by the Los Angeles Times in its lead editorial for January 18, 1966. I believe that this editorial should be read by all of our colleagues. Mr. Speaker, and I commend it now to their attention:

POVERTY AND POSITIVE THINKING

After taking the pulse of their constituents during adjournment, Members of Congress have returned to Washington in a critical mood toward President Johnson's war on poverty.

There is a widespread feeling that the guidelines laid down in the legislation enacted under White House pressure last year are too vague, leaving too much discretion in the hands of new and inexperienced officials.

The critics, who include friends as well as foes of the program, charge that confusion, waste and inefficiency have resulted—and that the benefits to the poor are questionable thus far.

No one should be surprised, of course, that an untried program of such massive and ambitious proportions should experience growing pains.

However, enemies of the antipoverty program—using the cost of the Vietnam conflict as an excuse—would like to scuttle the whole thing. This would be tragically shortsighted.

To many Americans, the war on poverty seems less urgent now because of the Nation's unprecedented prosperity and the decline of unemployment to a 7-year low. There is actually a shortage in many job categories.

But the antipoverty program was designed to help the hard core of poor and unemployed who lack basic job skills, and whose children are all but condemned to the same kind of existence by an environment of hopelessness.

Such marginal workers will remain jobless even in today's tight labor market unless special steps are taken. Given job training and employer interest, however, their opportunities will be better in this labor-short period.

Two Republican members of the House Labor Committee—Representatives ALBERT QUIE, of Minnesota, and CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York—have come up with some proposals that merit serious consideration.

They suggest more help for the rural poor, who make up half of the poverty community but receive only 5 to 10 percent of the community action money.

Especially intriguing is their proposal, similar to one by Representative GLEN LIPSCOMB, Republican of California, earlier, that tax incentives should be offered to private employers to train and employ the uneducated and unskilled.

Even before the Vietnam price tag grew so large, moderates such as Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, urged that 1966 be a year of stock taking—a time in which the programs voted last year should be assessed and improved.

The breathing spell is here. Republicans should be in the forefront of those using it constructively to find means of fighting the war on poverty as effectively and economically as possible—but fighting it, nonetheless.

Meanwhile, Sargent Shriver's departure from his Peace Corps post should enable him to devote full time to the job of improving the war on poverty.

Defense Study May Be Healthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times on January 13, 1966, carried an editorial commenting on the role of congressional inquiries into our defense policies.

It correctly points out that "House and Senate committees which deal with military affairs have not only the right, but the duty, to keep themselves informed on developments—and, within the bounds of national security, to air honest differences of opinion."

The editorial, which cites several areas that warrant attention relating to the bomber issue, missiles, inventory policies, and source of supplies for ammunition, goes on to state that "In this undertaking, they act as watchdogs for other members of Congress and for the public at large, whose lack of access to secret information makes it difficult for them to make intelligent judgments on defense controversies."

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the Los Angeles Times editorial for inclusion in the RECORD.

DEFENSE STUDY MAY BE HEALTHY

The House Armed Services Committee's scheduled inquiry into U.S. defense policies may be a healthy thing—or it may turn out to be a personal vendetta against Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara.

It all depends on the sense of responsibility displayed by Chairman MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, and his fellow committee members.

McNamara stepped on some sensitive political toes with his decision to close 149 military bases and his effort to force a merger of the Reserves and the National Guard.

The Defense Secretary, convinced that he was acting in the interest of economy and efficiency, failed to be deterred by criticism from powerful figures on Capitol Hill, including RIVERS.

It will be unfortunate if RIVERS tries to use the investigation, announced Tuesday, as a punitive expedition. A responsible inquiry, on the other hand, is definitely in the public interest.

House and Senate committees which deal with military affairs have not only the right, but the duty, to keep themselves informed on developments—and, within the bounds of national security, to air honest differences of opinion.

In this undertaking, they act as watchdogs for other Members of Congress and for the public at large, whose lack of access to secret information makes it difficult for them to make intelligent judgments on defense controversies.

Certainly there are several areas of legitimate inquiry at the present time.

Heading the list is the recent decision to phase out most of our big B–52 bombers and, as partial replacement, to build 200 bomber versions of the F–111 jet fighter.

Even though plans also call for a 25-percent increase in our long-range missile force, critics charge that the net effect will be to reduce America's nuclear striking power by about half.

There may be a valid reason, but the Nation is entitled to know more about what it is.

Secondly, reports have circulated that niggardly inventory policies caused serious shortages of certain military equipment for a time in Vietnam. It may not be true, but the facts should be aired within security bounds.

Finally, the Nation was shocked to learn during a recent strike that there was only one source of supply for certain types of ammunition.

Congress should satisfy itself that we are not leaving ourselves vulnerable to enemy sabotage or attack through a short-sighted effort to save money by buying key items from one supplier.

The Polish Insurrection of 1863

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, Americans of Polish descent in my State celebrated the 103d anniversary of the Polish insurrection of 1863. That heroic event has been a symbol to generations of Poles who have loved liberty but have been deprived of it. It continues to be so today.

The uprising against Russian rule broke out in the middle of religious ceremonies. There were collisions with Russian troops and victims fell in the streets of Warsaw. In response, the pro-Russian ruler, Count Aleksander Wielpolski, ordered that the revolutionary youth be recruited into the Russian Army. The young people fled to the forests, and on January 22, set up a revolutionary committee. The struggle of the ill-equipped but gallant insurgents lasted for almost 2 years in many parts of the country. A secret national government was set up in Warsaw. However, the promised assistance of Napoleon III never materialized and wholesale executions and deportations followed the suppression of the revolt. Poland became a Russian province.

But the Polish people have never forgotten the young patriots of 1863. On this occasion I wish to reaffirm my personal dedication to the cause of freedom in Poland. The history of the Polish people gives us reason for hope.

GOP Leaders Perform Important Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the minority leaders of the House and Senate in presenting a formal response to the President's state of the Union message has been widely applauded as a constructive effort toward more vigorous two-party congressional government. As unique as this step is in our own time, it is not without some precedent. After hearing President Washington deliver the first state of the Union message on January 8, 1790, to a joint session of Congress, the House appointed a committee of three to prepare a reply, "with assurances that this House will without delay proceed to take into their serious consideration the important matters recommended to their attention." This was, of course, before the introduction of the two-party system into the legislative branch.

What links the action of the Republican congressional leadership with that of the first Congress is the concern to indicate that the Houses of Congress are established to conduct debate among the people's chosen representatives for the purpose of determining what is in the general welfare of the country. The state of the Union message is not the last word, it is only the first word in that debate. The establishment of the practice of a formal response to the President's message was and is clearly intended to underscore that fact. Unfortunately in recent years there has been a growing tendency merely to see Congress as a place of ratification for executive branch decisions, a convenient means for holding plebiscites, as it were.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an indication of the impact that this first minority party state of the Union message has had in Michigan's Sixth Congressional District, as found in the cogent editorial of the State Journal of Lansing on Thursday, January 20, 1966:

GOP Leaders Perform Important Service

The presentation Monday night of the Republican appraisal of the state of the Union was a praiseworthy display of the loyal opposition in action.

The old Supreme Court chamber in the National Capitol was the forum for the historic event. It was the first time the minority in Congress has formally offered its views on the state of the Nation.

The manner in which the views were presented was in keeping with the highest traditions of a nation whose foundations include the vital element of the right to dissent.

The occasion was wholly free of expressions of personal or partisan animosity. Criticism was offered with dignity and was aimed not at personalities but at programs and policies which the Republican leadership deems unwise.

Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Republican, of Grand Rapids, House minority leader, and Senator Everett M. Dirksen, Republican, of Illinois, Senate minority leader, shared the microphone. Ford spoke on domestic issues and Dirksen voiced party policy on international affairs.

In his share of a "loyal dissent" to President Johnson's state of the Union message, Ford said no tax increase will be necessary if Federal spending is prudently restrained.

The Michigan Congressman vowed an effort to trim the $112.8 billion in Federal spending Johnson recommended to Congress and called on the President to submit a budget with expenditures rated according to priority.

"If he fails to do so," Ford said, "we call upon the Democrats in Congress to join us in eliminating, reducing, or deferring low-priority items * * *.

"Whatever is needed—really needed—for national security must be provided. Urgent domestic programs * * * need not be sacrificed * * *."

Ford said Republicans will back programs that really aid the needy, contribute to economic growth and advance the cause of equal opportunity but that "we must liberate the war on poverty from waste, controversy, and the bad odor of political bossism."

The poor, he said, should have an important role in policy decisions and the States should be partners in the war on poverty.

In his discussion of foreign affairs, Senator Dirksen expressed agreement with President Johnson's basic policy in Vietnam.

Johnson pledged in his message last week to continue the quest for peace in Vietnam but promised also: "We will stay until aggression has stopped."

Dirksen said Monday night: "Let the peace efforts continue. Who can object to any honorable effort to secure peace where young blood is involved?

Let the military effort continue. It demonstrates our determination to keep our word. Let it be intensified if necessary as sound military judgment dictates."

Like Johnson, Dirksen said any American retreat would undermine confidence in America's will to resist Communist expansion.

On the matter of foreign aid, Dirksen said billions of dollars have gained the United States little respect and less appreciation. He called for a precise auditing of foreign aid spending, together with a careful check on future aid programs, to see "whether there will be dividends in the form of good will and real devotion to peace and freedom."

We believe Representative Ford and Senator Dirksen have performed an important service to their country and to their party and that the way in which they presented their views deserves the commendation of all Americans—Republicans and Democrats and those with no political party affiliations.

We also believe President Johnson and other Democrats who must shoulder the responsibilities imposed on the majority party, would do well to accept the counsel and constructive criticism in the fine spirit in which they were offered.

A Plan That Would Weaken Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to extend the term of Members of the House to 4 years, to be elected during presidential election years, has elicited considerable interest throughout the country. In the coming weeks there undoubtedly will be extensive debate on this and other proposals to lengthen the term. Such debate will be beneficial, and certainly all arguments must be given careful consideration and evaluation. A Chicago Tribune editorial of January 21, 1966, presents compelling arguments against the President's proposal for a 4-year term. I for one do not favor the President's proposal, and urge my colleagues to take a few minutes to read the Tribune editorial, which follows:

A Plan That Would Weaken Congress

President Johnson seems to think that the Founding Fathers of the Republic were old fogies.

"Our democracy cannot remain static, a prisoner to the past, if it is to enrich the lives of coming generations," he said in a message to Congress urging a constitutional amendment to lengthen the terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years.

The same proposal was made by the President in his state of the Union address, and it got more applause than anything else. Nevertheless, there are many Members of Congress who doubt that the terms of Representatives should be lengthened.

The question was debated at length at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. The terms of Senators had been fixed at 6 years, with one-third of them to be elected every 2 years. Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, and other New Englanders urged that House Members should have 1-year terms so that the House would constantly provide a constant flow of power from the people.

David Jenifer, of Maryland, proposed a 3-year term, arguing that a shorter term would make the job "precarious" and unattractive to prudent men. The Convention compromised on a 2-year term.

Under President Johnson's proposed amendment, candidates for House would run for office during presidential election years. He said the 4-year tenure would attract "the best men in private and public life" and would free House Members from pressures of biennial campaigns.

We think it more likely that the Johnson plan would assure a House composed principally of Presidential coattail riders—a group very much like the weak, supine Congress elected in the Johnson landslide of 1964. Previous recommendations for lengthening the terms of Representatives have sought to avoid this objection by having half of the Members elected every 2 years.

The present system of electing all the House Members every 2 years serves as a useful national referendum on the Federal Government's policies. Four years is too long for the people to wait to register their confidence or their lack of confidence in an administration.

President Johnson, in his message to Congress, said he did not feel it necessary to hold an election every 2 years to allow the voice of the people to be heard. Modern methods of communication and public opinion polls leave little doubt about popular feelings, he said.

Under this theory, all elections are unnecessary; Members of Congress could be appointed for life with instructions to vote according to the latest public opinion poll.

The President's protest that 2-year terms require Members of the House to engage in continuous politicking has some merit, but it affects only a minority of the House Members. Those from Chicago and other large cities are merely appointed by the political machine, and few of them have to do any politicking to be reelected. Many House Members are returned year after year, as the seniority records show.

Nothing in the history of the United States indicates that the Founding Fathers were wrong in deciding on 2-year terms.

A Better Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bitter and hostile transit strike in New York City is not a problem unique to that city. The growing cost of public transportation and the need to effectively serve our metropolitan areas are problems facing the entire Nation.

It is obvious, however, that the settlement achieved in New York City was not in the public interest and, in effect, rewarded Mike Quill and his fellow union officers for abusing the public interest.

A very timely and practical editorial comment was carried by the Economist newspapers, serving south Cook County, Ill., on January 19, and I believe it reflects rational public opinion throughout the country:

A BETTER WAY

Taxpayers of the entire State of New York are going to have to contribute $100 million a year to make possible the $52 to $70 million increase in wages won by the city of New York's transit workers after tieing up the metropolis for 9 days with their strike.

But, more importantly, the $100 million statewide levy is intended to preserve the 15-cent rate of fare charged on the city's subways and buses.

Of course, if the taxpayers of the State have no objection to subsidizing the subway and bus riders, we shouldn't either because it won't cost us a dime.

But the situation offers a lesson for Chicago and that is the fare on the rapid transit and bus lines should always be adequate enough to defray the cost of the service. In contrast to the New York fare of 15 cents, the Chicago fare is 25 cents.

New York City got into subsidizing its transportation facilities more than 20 years ago when the party in power decided at was important for its welfare to maintain the 5-cent fare. So it passed the load of the extra cost on the city's taxpayers. During the intervening years, the cost of the taxpayers has been staggering. In fact, that is why Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller decided to pass part of the burden on to the State.

From our point of view, subsidizing transit facilities is unfair. It compels those who do not use them to contribute so that those who do ride may do so for less.

Chicago Transit Authority should hold down costs, of course, but if the present rate of fare is insufficient it should be raised to offset any deficit. In other words, those who use the lines should pay the cost.

Job Training Incentive Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note the widespread support for the human investment legislation pending in Congress.

Seeing to it that we have sufficient trained minds and skilled hands to keep up with the pace being set by the technologies of today and that all the people can have full and productive lives is a great challenge. It is to this challenge that the human investment proposal is addressed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit to the Record an editorial that appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times expressing support for this legislation.

JOB TRAINING INCENTIVE NEEDED

As a spur to investment in plants, machinery and equipment, the Federal Government wrote into the 1962 Revenue Act a 7-percent tax credit for such capital improvements.

Bills awaiting congressional action in January would allow a like credit to employers who establish training programs to upgrade the skills of their employees.

The theory is that the present law provides an economic incentive for corporations to rate investment in machines and bricks above investment in people.

Such and intriguing idea is gaining support despite the fact that some questions have been raised as to the scope of the proposal.

Almost 2 years ago a U.S. Senate labor committee researcher proposed a training subsidy at a Los Angeles hearing. In June 1964 a special Federal committee on apprenticeship programs made a similar recommendation. It noted that cost to employers was the greatest single bar to expension of on-the-job training.

The "human investment" bills now before Congress—there are more than a score of them—were drawn by a Republican research team. Proponents contend that job training by private industry minimizes the necessity for Government intervention and regulation, and eliminates the bureaucratic middleman.

Several safeguards have been written into the program since it was originally introduced. It is probable that remaining questions can be clarified in hearings to be conducted by Senate and House committees.

Representative Glenard P. Lipscomb, Republican, of Los Angeles, one of the sponsors, points out that letting free enterprise do the job is in the American tradition.

We agree with that view.

The need for "human investment" is apparent. Hopefully, Congress will be able to write a program to meet that need.

Auto and Telephone Taxes Not Justified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, of the many recommendations put forth by the President in his state of the Union message, perhaps none has aroused more concern on both sides of the aisle in Congress, outside the Vietnam situation, than his request to cancel the repeal of the long-standing temporary, discriminatory excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service.

I have already voiced my own protest against reimposing these unfair burdens on the consumers of two of our Nation's businesses simply because the automotive and communications industries are presently prosperous. There is no good reason to reinject in our tax structure an inequity that has taken years to remove. The President himself has complimented the automotive industry for its cooperation in passing along the 3-percent reduction in the automobile excise tax initially put into effect. It is clear, therefore, that it is the automobile consumer who will pay for this tax.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to point out to my colleagues that I am far from alone in holding these views, as is clearly indicated by the editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen-Patriot of January 21, entitled "Auto and Telephone Taxes Not Justified" which calls particular attention to the timely and compelling arguments against the auto excise tax recently put forth by my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths].

AUTO AND TELEPHONE TAXES NOT JUSTIFIED

Why has the President requested a cancellation of Federal excise reductions on automobiles and telephones?

The question is being asked in various ways by many persons.

And the query always is accompanied by the statement that telephones and automobiles hardly are luxuries—which they are not. And the incongruity of restoring excise taxes on these items while permitting them to be lifted from merchandise which definitely falls into the luxury class generally manages to creep into the discussions.

Asking the question where it counts is Representative Martha W. Griffiths, Democrat, of Michigan, whose home town of Detroit prides itself on being the center of the automobile industry. Mrs. Griffiths promises to be a dissenting minority of one, if necessary, when the House Ways and Means Committee approves the President's request, as it is expected to do.

"The automobile," says Mrs. Griffiths, "is the lifeblood of the U.S. economy." She adds that one of every six persons in the country now is directly or indirectly employed in the automobile industry.

Thus does it make sense to restore a 1-percent tax which was dropped at the first of the year, in order to bring in some $60 million in added revenue? Mrs. Griffiths believes that it does not and many will agree with her. They also like her comment that to put excise taxes back on automobiles and telephones, while leaving it off "diamonds and sables," is unjustified.

What is happening here, of course, is something that is as old as the tax system itself. That is getting quick and easy money with little regard to the justice of the thing.

The U.S. Government admittedly will need more revenue if it is to carry on the war in Vietnam and finance all the Great Society programs at the same time.

Deficits inherently are bad because they tend to contribute to inflation.

But even assuming that more revenue is necessary, it is hard to make a case for restoration of the automobile and telephone taxes.

The reasoning in the White House may be correct—but it isn't right. It is that both the automotive and communciations industries are prosperous and expanding at the moment. And because the effects of the January 1 tax reductions scarcely have been noticed by the public, restoring the levies would be relatively "painless" to the customers.

That kind of reasoning has brought about the mixed-up and generally unjust system of excise taxes which have grown up in the past 30 years.

One of the things which is bad about the automobile tax is that the owners of motor vehicles carry a tremendous tax burden—much of which is justified.

They pay tremendous amounts of money into public treasuries at both the State and National level to finance the construction of roads. These are users' taxes and they are quite proper. Without them, the highway system would be in worse trouble than it is. Cars would not be sold in great quantities and the industry would not make its all-important contribution to the economy and general prosperity because there would be no place to drive.

Lawmakers and the President possibly move on the theory that the automobile owner is so accustomed to paying taxes that he won't mind another small bite, such as 1 percent of the cost of a new car. Probably he won't. He paid 10 percent on his new cars for years before the tax was reduced by 3 percent last year. But it is just possible that this reduction in the excise levy contributed to the banner year the industry enjoyed in 1965. The 1-percent cut which went into effect January 1 might be just the spark that is needed to keep automobile sales rolling and all the persons connected with the industry gainfully employed—and paying individual income taxes into the Federal Treasury.

The morality of the thing, however, is just as important as the economics.

Why automobiles and telephones?

Why must these necessities be singled out for treatment as luxuries when more tax money is needed?

Proportional Representation: For Better or for Worse?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a major underlying principle of our American form of government is that of representative government. It is true that in the American system of government, the consent of the people is projected through their chosen representatives in the halls of Government—local, State, and National. These are elected representatives and are the means whereby society establishes its order. Thus, it is politics that constitutes the search for governmental power and influence. In this quest for political position, the interest of various groups must always be considered. The final determination, however, under our American system is the will of the majority. Of course, one must be mindful of the rights of the minority as guaranteed by our Constitution and laws. It is in that light that we have established the separation of powers and the checks and balances within the structure of our Government. The result is that the stability of law is established.

In our Government methods have been established such as voting, the right of petitions, referendums, and constitutional conventions, in order to reflect the expressions of the various interests of the people, both majority and minority, in order that the consent of the people may be garnered to favor one policy or the other.

I do not believe that proportional representation is consistent with the general traits of our American democratic representative system. In theory, proportional representation purports to foster individualism and freedom of action in representative government. In practice it falls far short of those goals. Historically, a major consequence of proportional representation has been the increase and cohesivensss of political groupings. European experiences under proportional representation demonstrate the instability of the governments it spawned. Efforts are made to organize and control a quota of voters because only a part of the electorate, a mere quota, is needed to elect a single representative. There is no need for a plurality; thus, what is commonly known as "bullet voting" is encouraged. The experience of the city of New York is a concrete example of such results. I recall our experience of the late thirties in the city council where representatives of minority groups, including the Communist Party, were able to foist upon the city of New York membership in that body. That was accomplished solely by the "bullet vote." Moreover, many votes are also wasted under that system.

I am a firm believer in the two-party system in American politics. Proportional representation militates against a strong two-party system. It seeks to carve party slates for office into quotas and encourages a system of preferred candidates over party candidates. Such a system is not in the best interest of all the people. A preferred candidate of a particular local group may achieve a seat in the representative chamber of government but that preferred individual will then become the voice of one crying in a governmental wilderness. He will not represent majority opinion, nor the consent of the governed. His interests are not those of all the people but only some of the people—a select group. Such politics is not American politics. It is not good government, it is not true representative democracy. Our political system must represent the will of the majority and respect and preserve the rights of the minority at all times and in all places.

Buffalo Booster John Galvin Is Chamber of Commerce Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, John M. Galvin is one of Buffalo's truly outstanding business and civic leaders. It was more than 20 years ago that he began his civic and charitable activities. Over the years, he has been an officer or director of at least 50 business, philanthropic, community, and religious organizations.

It would be hard to select one activity as Mr. Galvin's outstanding accomplishment. But, in my opinion, it has been the vigorous leadership he has given to Buffalo's exciting multimillion-dollar downtown renewal program. This dynamic rejuvenation effort is thrusting up new skyscraper office buildings into Buffalo skies, giving Buffalo a dramatic new look and recharging it with new energy, civic pride, and enthusiasm.

As the chief executive of one of the Nation's few billion-dollar banks, the Marine Midland Trust Co. of Western New York, Mr. Galvin has a high position of leadership and responsibility. He has filled this post and many others with distinction and dedication. I am proud to say that I am his Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, Saturday, John Galvin added another high honor to his impressive list of laurels. He was cited as the "Man of the Year" by the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, Mr. Speaker, I here include articles from the Buffalo Evening News and Buffalo Courier Express of January 20, which report on John M. Galvin's latest high honor:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Jan. 20, 1966]

BUFFALO BOOSTER, JOHN GALVIN, IS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE MAN OF THE YEAR—WILL RECEIVE AWARD TUESDAY EVENING AT 122D ANNUAL RECEPTION AND BANQUET

John M. Galvin, a banker who has made boosting Buffalo a full-time job, is the 1965 Man of the Year of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Galvin, 60, chief executive officer of the Marine Midland Trust Co. of Western New York, will receive the award Tuesday evening at the chamber's 122d annual reception and banquet in the Statler Hilton.

A chamber official said 34 men were nominated for the award "but it was no contest. John won going away."

Mr. Galvin, who began his 45-year banking career as a "trotter," or messenger boy, in

1921 for the Lafayette National Bank, now is one of the top managers of the Nation's few billion dollar banks.

SINCE THE EARLY FORTIES

A product of South Buffalo, Mr. Galvin's rise in the financial world has been paralleled by "an almost inexhaustible capacity for good works," as a chamber director puts it.

He began his civic and charitable activity in the early forties with the Buffalo Junior Chamber of Commerce and Catholic Charities and in 25 years he has been an officer or director of at least 50 business, philanthropic, community, and religious organizations.

Mr. Galvin will add the chamber's Man of the Year Award to a host of other honors, ranging from the Silver Beaver Award of the Boy Scouts of America of investiture in 1962 as a magistral knight of the Sovereign Order of Malta in the United States.

"I just get carried away," he said, explaining how he takes on one civic assignment after another, "but you have to let yourself get carried away to get anything done."

SO MUCH TO OFFER

One job he pursues with relish is working as chairman of the chamber's Boost Buffalo Committee, and he wishes more people shared his enthusiasm for Buffalo.

"We have so much to offer," he says, "how many cities have as much? And we haven't even scratched the surface. But we often get ourselves so submerged under a few setbacks that we don't see the bright side."

Dr. Edward Teller, one of the world's great nuclear physicists, will be the speaker at the chamber banquet.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Jan. 20, 1966]

BY AREA CHAMBER: GALVIN IS NAMED 1965 MAN OF YEAR

John M. Galvin, chief executive officer of Marine Midland Trust Co. of Western New York and one of the most active boosters of the Niagara frontier, has been selected by members of the Buffalo Area Chamber of Commerce as the 1965 man of the year.

The silver-haired banker, who rose from messenger boy to a top post in one of the Nation's largest banks, will receive the award at the chamber's 122d annual dinner Tuesday night. He will be featured in the January issue of Buffalo magazine, official monthly publication of the chamber, which sponsors the award.

BUFFALO NATIVE

Galvin was born October 30, 1905, in Buffalo and was graduated from St. Joseph's Collegiate Institute. He began his banking career as a messenger at the old Lafayette National Bank when he was 16. He attended Millard Fillmore College of the University of Buffalo while working at the bank and later attended the American Institute of Banking.

He stayed with the bank when it became part of the Buffalo Trust Co., which, in turn, was merged into the Marine Trust Co., now Marine Midland Trust Co.

PROMOTIONS CITED

Galvin was made an assistant treasurer in 1933 and became an assistant vice president in 1945, taking charge of the Midland time plan of the Marine Midland Group. He was elected vice president in 1948 and became director of public relations for the bank in 1951.

He rose to senior vice president in 1958, executive vice president in 1961, and was elected chairman of the executive committee and chief executive officer in May 1962.

Throughout his career Galvin has been active in civic, religious, and governmental affairs and has for many years been among the leaders of any activity which would serve to promote the interests of western New York.

He was cited by the Courier-Express as Good Fellow of the Year in 1958. He was the 1963 Man of the Year of the Greater Buffalo Advertising Club and received the 1964 National Brotherhood Citation of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and many other awards.

He is a director of the chamber and chairman of its Boost Buffalo Committee and has served as a board member or officer of countless charitable and civic enterprises. He also served for 10 years as a member of the old Erie County Board of Social Welfare while it was responsible for the administration of welfare in the county.

The chamber, in announcing the award, said that 34 men were nominated for the award this year but that Galvin was the overwhelming choice, drawing more than twice as many votes as the runnerup nominee.

Galvin and his wife, Grace, live at 25 Woodbury Drive, Snyder. They have three children.

At the annual banquet scheduled for 7 p.m. in the Terrace Room of Hotel Statler Hilton, other highlights will include the presentation of the Buffalo Jaycees' Donald F. Stillwagon Memorial Gold Key Award and address by Dr. Edward Teller.

Resolution for a Redwood National Park, Adopted by Democratic Central Committee of the State of Michigan, January 9, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted unanimously by the State central committee of the Democratic Party of the State of Michigan on January 9, 1966, enthusiastically supporting the concept of a Redwood National Park to preserve some of the small remaining area of what was once over 2 million acres of virgin redwood forest.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION FOR A REDWOOD NATIONAL PARK ADOPTED BY A DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, JANUARY 9, 1966

Whereas the California redwood forests are some of the Nation's most outstanding scenic resources, and the demand of the people of the entire Nation for such irreplaceable areas of spectacular natural beauty is ever increasing; and

Whereas of the over 2 million acres of virgin redwood forest that once forested the northern coast of California there is only one remaining major block of land suitable for a national park; and

Whereas the area of the proposed park is being logged right now, and the time is almost past when it will be possible to save this area from damage by logging and freeways, and the flood and storm damage which result when the watershed is destroyed; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan go on record in support of the establishment of a 90,000-acre Redwood National Park on the northern coast of California in the Prairie Creek-Redwood Creek groves and Gold Bluffs wild beach area, as recommended by the National Park Service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Democratic State Central Committee of Michigan request President Johnson and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall to make every effort to arrange a moratorium on logging in the proposed park area until Congress has acted on the proposal now before it; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators MCNAMARA and HART and to the Democratic Congressmen from Michigan.

What the Repeal of Section 14(b) Would Mean for New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters recently which indicate that there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the real significance of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, which the House of Representatives voted by a large margin to repeal last year.

For purposes of clarification, I should like to make the following brief statement on the subject "What the Repeal of Section 14(b) Would Mean for New York State."

The so-called right-to-work laws are misnamed: they do not give anyone a right to work, nor do they protect jobs. What these laws do is to interfere with free collective bargaining, by prohibiting voluntary contracts between unions and employers which require that all who enjoy the fruits of bargaining share equally in the cost of such representation. Section 14(b) permits States to enact such laws.

New York State has no such law and the repeal or retention of 14(b) would therefore not affect any rights now enjoyed by the workers in our State. The 19 States—primarily southern—which do have such laws use them to try to lure industry from New York to their States. The repeal of section 14(b) would therefore stop this unfair competition and would help maintain job opportunities in our State.

It is important also to understand what repeal of 14(b) would not do. It would not affect the prohibition in the Taft-Hartley Act against requiring a man to join a union to get a job—that is, the closed shop.

It would not take away the existing right of employees covered by a union shop contract, by secret ballot, to suspend enforcement of the union shop if a majority desire to do so.

It would not take away any employee's right to refuse to join a union—even under a union shop the employee can, if he prefers, pay to the union an amount equal to membership dues.

In short, repeal of 14(b) would protect New York workers' jobs against unfair competition while retention of this provision gives them no rights they do not presently enjoy.

The Vietnam Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, in its lead editorial Friday morning, makes several pertinent points regarding the decisions now facing the administration in light of the apparent lack of a response from Hanoi to our peace offensive.

The Times emphasizes that "many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is that fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year."

The decisive new element, the Times points out, is the ninefold increase in American troops in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile—

The newspaper observes—

> it has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table.

Warning against further escalation of the war, the Times warns:

> A further large-scale buildup would not end the military statement in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration, and additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia, and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

Apparently alluding to a letter from Gen. James M. Gavin, appearing in the latest Harper's magazine and to which I alluded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 18, 1966, the Times concludes as follows:

> At the present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the New York Times lead editorial of Friday, January 20:

THE VIETNAM DECISION

Failure of the Johnson peace offensive thus far to bring about formal negotiations with Hanoi inescapably raises the question: what course should the United States now follow?

Much depends on Washington's evaluation of Hanoi's ambiguous public and private replies and on the official estimate of how long it is safe to keep the bombers grounded. Is Hanoi holding out for concessions? Or is Hanoi seeking to avoid a conference out of the conviction that the United States will get tired and withdraw? President Johnson expressed the latter belief yesterday. But his conclusion from this remains unclear, since he also said: "The door of peace must be kept wide open."

Many factors counsel patience. The 2-month absence of North Vietnamese Army units from combat in South Vietnam—which may signal a Hanoi desire to continue the diplomatic exchanges—is one such factor. Far more important is the fact that the military balance in South Vietnam has been fundamentally transformed in the past year.

The decisive new element has been the ninefold buildup of American troops in South Vietnam to a strength of about 190,000. South Vietnamese armed forces, including militia and police, now exceed 635,000. With South Korean, New Zealand, and Australian units, there are upward of 850,000 men in the field. And the backing of American air and naval strength gives these forces devasting firepower and unparalleled mobility.

This buildup, in the words of President Johnson's state of the Union message, has put the enemy on notice that "time is no longer on his side" and that a Vietcong victory now is "out of reach."

Meanwhile, it has become evident that the bombing of North Vietnam failed to achieve either of its original two objectives. It failed to slow down the infiltration of men and supplies, which increased as the bombing intensified. And it failed to bring Hanoi to the conference table. The bombing did force North Vietnam to turn from Peiping to Moscow for antiaircraft missiles and, even more important, for massive economic and technical aid. But this unexpected dividend argues for a continued suspension of the bombing, rather than for its resumption.

As White House Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy recently observed: "It has been made clear to us over a long period of time that the Soviet Government hopes there can be a peaceful settlement." And Moscow has also made it clear that peace efforts cannot be carried on while North Vietnam is being bombed.

The critical decision that confronts President Johnson, therefore, is not whether to resume the early bombing of the north—which even Republican leaders no longer press—but how to conduct the war in the south while continuing the probes for peace. The ground and air war in South Vietnam undoubtedly will resume fully after the lunar new year truce. What the President now must decide is whether to escalate that war in the south to a wholly new level by yielding to military requests for a doubling of American forces. Such a move would finally convert the struggle from a Vietnamese conflict into an American war against Asians.

A further large-scale buildup would not end the military stalemate in South Vietnam. As in the past, it would be matched by increased Vietcong recruiting, infiltration of additional North Vietnamese units and ultimately—if the ground war expanded into Laos, Cambodia, and, perhaps, North Vietnam—by the entrance of Chinese troops into the conflict.

At present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice, not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

The Late Honorable John Taber

SPEECH
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late John Taber was a most valuable Member of this body. He served with great distinction for nearly 40 years. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, once as chairman, he became known as the watchdog of the Treasury. In that capacity he was instrumental in saving American taxpayers untold billions of dollars. It is doubtful if any one Member has ever done more in that respect.

John Taber was indeed a great American. He was devoted to the cause of good government, of sensible restraint in the function of the Central Government, and of those fundamentals which make the competitive free enterprise succeed. During his long period of distinguished service Mr. Taber did more than his share in the preservation of our institutions. We need more men of his dedication if our Republic is to be preserved.

An Intern's Views on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have had numerous occasions to utilize the fine services of summer interns and are particularly grateful for the enthusiams and interest they bring to their responsibilities.

Last summer I was pleased to have the services of Dan Spangler of Cody, Wyo., as a summer intern in my office. Dan, the son of Judge and Mrs. J. O. Spangler of Cody graduated in 1964 from the University of Wyoming with a degree in political science. He was attending Stanford University when he was selected as an intern for the Wyoming congressional office.

After a most satisfactory summer of employment Dan enrolled at the University of London under a Rotary International scholarship. His exposure there to students from many countries has broadened his outlook on American foreign policy. At a time when the sentiments of some college students have created apprehension in the minds of many Americans, I am happy to note his thoughtful and responsible approach to this serious matter. I respectfully recommend his essay on Vietnam to the consideration of my colleagues as a worthy example of the mature outlook youth can offer when stimulated to take an active interest in the affairs of government. His essays follows:

VIETNAM

The greatest problem of our time is how to achieve world peace. A world war could destroy civilization as we know it. Nuclear weapons have enabled the two great powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to achieve a state of mutual deterrence. The threat to peace does not come from any direct conflict between these two states but from the possibility that they will become involved in what would begin as a limited war, then expand into a regional war until the interests of these two powers were directly involved, leaving no other alternative but a world conflagration. The existence of large numbers of new, unstable states creates a number of opportunities for limited wars to expand into regional and world wars. In this situation, it is essential that the United States maintain flexible policies so that an escalated war will not be the only alternative. Before the present war widens any further, it is essential that the U.S. Congress conduct a public debate to explore fully the alternatives to a wider war and to insure that U.S. policy in southeast Asia expresses the will of the American people.

Historically, the area now know as North Vietnam has been the smallest but most densely populated sector of Indochina. North Vietnam was once controlled by China but in 939 A.D. its people revolted and established their own kingdom. Due to population pressures and poor agricultural land, after 1069 the North Vietnamese advanced steadily into neighboring lands of the south and west, overrunning large portions of what is now South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. This expansion continued for 800 years until it was halted by the imposition of French colonialism. After the Japanese invaded the area during World War II, French authority was never reestablished in the north and the northern drive to the south and west began once more. The French attempted to arrest this drive until their defeat at Dienbienphu in 1954. The Geneva Agreement of that year, which was never signed by the United States, called for a united Vietnam within 1 year. The agreement was never carried out, mainly because it was unrealistic and dangerous.

THE DIFFERENT FACTIONS

It is unrealistic to attempt to unify areas which offer as many contrasts as North and South Vietnam. Life in North Vietnam is still greatly influenced by Chinese ways due to China's former domination of the north and to the close proximity of the north to China. Geographically, North Vietnam is more closely linked with China than with South Vietnam. The north has adopted China's subtropical agricultural methods while the tropical south has a different way of life. There has long been a rivalry between Hanoi, a former Chinese capital and a cultural and administrative center, on one hand, and Saigon, a French-created port, commercial, and agricultural marketing city on the other. Communications have never been good between the two areas.

During World War II, Hanoi took its orders from the Vichy regime while Saigon was the center for the Gaullists. In opposition to French colonial rule, nationalist leaders in the north identified with the Kuomintang in China while the Cao Dai and Hoa Hoa factions led the nationalists in the south. With these profound differences in the development of North and South Vietnam, it is unrealistic to suppose that they could form a viable state.

THE AREA

The unification of Vietnam under the aggressive Communist regime of the north would be dangerous for the neighboring states as well, which have not forgotten the earlier period of Vietnamese invasion and domination. For, with the seizure of the rich rice lands in South Vietnam, the well-trained and equipped northern army would easily have Laos and Cambodia at its mercy. Laos is the largest, least populated country in Indochina, and it has the least capacity to defend itself. The country is deeply divided ethnically an politically. Cambodia is also sparsely populated and is in a vulnerable strategic position.

Ships using the Cambodian capital, Phnom Penh, on the Mekong River, have to pass through South Vietnam. The Mekong Delta is open to attack from coastal and interior routes which can be commanded from North Vietnam and Laos. Thus, it is essential to the security of Cambodia that South Vietnam and Laos are in friendly hands. To the west of Laos lies Thailand. The bulk of the Lao people live in Thailand, which has much reason to fear a Vietnamese-Laos combination. In addition, from 50,000 to 80,000 pro-Communist refugees from Vietnam have settled in northeast Thailand since World War II.

The instability and remoteness of northeastern Thailand make it imperative that the northeastern border is occupied by a stable Laos. These compounded problems of national security would be the consequences of a Vietnam united under a Communist regime. The expansionist tendencies of a Communist-controlled Vietnam would engulf the entire Indochinese Peninsula in large-scale warfare. As the war would expand, China would become more anxious to protect its borders and would play a larger part in the struggle. Eventually, the vital interests of such powers as India, Indonesia, and the Soviet Union might become directly involved.

The security of Australia and New Zealand, both close American allies, depends upon a stable situation in southeast Asia, as World War II demonstrated. Britain is pledged to the defense of Malaysia and could become drawn into a wider struggle. If the eventually victorious powers in southeast Asia maintained close relations with China or fell under Chinese domination, the United States could be subject to a grave threat.

THE CHINA ROLE

It is difficult to tell if the Chinese always mean what they say but the Chinese leaders have pledged themselves to the destruction of the United States. In light of these pronouncements, the United States must keep a close watch on China, which is now a nuclear power. In the coming years, it may be expected that China will achieve the capacity to deliver its nuclear weapons around the world.

From our experience with the Soviet Union, it is clear that the best way to meet a nuclear threat is with another nuclear threat. But, if southern Asia were in the control of hostile powers, the United States would face great problems in mounting a credible deterrent to a Chinese nuclear force. Present-day missiles fired from the continental United States, can reach China only by crossing Soviet territory. This only increases the danger that the Soviet Union would aline with China in a war against the United States. Although relations are tense between Russia and China, the Soviet Union has given no indication that it would prefer a non-Communist Chinese regime.

BALANCE OF POWER

Thus, the U.S. presence in Vietnam can be seen as an effort at limiting the scope of armed conflict in southern Asia, to insure that the great powers are not drawn into an open conflict in a wider war. Such a wider war would be certain to result if the United States did not provide a balance to the forces of North Vietnam. A balance of power strategy is utilized to guarantee that no one power has enough strength to subdue the other states. Without the balance provided by the United States, and with North Vietnamese possession of the rich ricelands of South Vietnam, the balance in southeast Asia would be torn asunder.

This would happen because the states of southeast Asia are so weak internally. But if the policies of the United States are successful, these countries will someday be able to stand on their own feet. Before this happens, great changes must take place for the area is woefully underdeveloped and many of the people lack any sense of national identity and loyalty. These changes may come about in one of two ways—violently or peacefully. The Communists advocate violent change while the United States has always realized that peaceful change, through foreign aid and technical assistance, is in its best interests.

POVERTY THE REAL EVIL

Any successful foreign policy must be defined in terms of national interests and backed with adequate power. An American policy aimed at preserving the territorial integrity of Asian states while assisting in their economic and social development is in the American interest. The question that the American people and the U.S. Congress must now answer is whether or not that policy is backed by adequate power.

There is no doubt that the United States is able to apply enough military power to prevent an overt Communist takeover. But this tactic, by itself, will never bring stability to the region. American foreign policy in southeast Asia must receive more support from another form of power, which is the ability of the United States to encourage social and economic development. Stability can be achieved only if progress is made in this area, for poverty is a necessary prerequisite for the success of Communist revolutionary guerrilla warfare.

Every successful Communist revolution, whether in Russia, China, Cuba, or Indochina, has been based upon impoverished masses. The Vietcong would have collapsed long ago without support from the people in the countryside. It is futile for the United States to remain in South Vietnam unless a massive effort is made to unite the South Vietnamese people behind their government. This task cannot wait until the war is over because the war will never end until social and economic changes are made.

Besides intensifying our efforts in present developmental programs, we should give renewed thought to the development of the Mekong River, which affects the livelihood of the entire Indochinese peninsula. The political fragmentation and strategic weaknesses of northeast Thailand, Cambodia, South Vietnam, and Laos are due partly to obstacles which make the Mekong difficult to navigate. By helping the southeast Asian nations to harness and develop this vital waterway, the United States could score a great victory in the battle for peaceful change by stimulating the imagination and loyalties of people in the most troubled parts of the region and by providing the opportunity for a better life to millions of Asians.

CAUTION

In defending our national interests, we must proceed with restraint and must view the scene from the vantage point of other nations, as well as our own. We must not allow ourselves to be placed in a position in which we no longer have any reasonable alternatives. As regard our policies in southeast Asia, the words of Bolingbroke are particularly relevant:

"Victories, that bring honor to the arms, may bring shame to the councils, of a nation. To win a battle, to take a town, is the glory of a general, and of an army. * * * But the glory of a nation is to proportion the ends she proposes, to her interests and her strength; the means she employs, to the ends she proposes; and the vigor she exerts, to both."

This is a time when momentous decisions must be made concerning future American policies in southeast Asia. The decisions we make can be of vital importance to the future of mankind. Therefore, in this session of congressional debate, let all opinions be voiced, let all factors be considered, and let us coldly calculate the effects of our past, present, and future actions. And finally, let us remember the judgment of our posterity with the words of Abraham Lincoln:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation."

Man Will Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world are focused on the Far East today.

For it is there that the question most sharply asked is: "Will men be free or will men be slaves?"

And the answer from courageous men is that man will live as a free individual.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN—my distinguished colleague from South Carolina and a great American—underscored those points in a stirring speech January 23 at Taipei, Republic of China.

His remarks are an inspiration to those who cherish freedom, a ray of hope to the nameless faces enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. His message was clear and should give pause for thought to those misguided despots laboring under the delusion that America is soft, or will fail her commitments in the Far East.

His speech is of such import that I commend it for reading by the Members of the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereby insert his message for the information of this body:

MEN WILL BE FREE

(Address by Congressman WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN of South Carolina at the 12th annual Freedom Day Rally Taipei, the Republic of China, January 23)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring you the greetings and the admiration of the Congress of the United States and the American people. As a member of the advisory board of the National Captive Nations' Committee and on behalf of that committee I bring to you the best wishes of captive peoples all over the world. You, of the Republic of China, have won the enduring admiration of free peoples everywhere by your valiant and successful struggle to maintain the freedom of this island. You are the hope of freedom throughout the mainland. Your past is an inspiring saga of man's indomitable will to be free. Your present is a source of pride and hope to all who hate tyranny. Your future is nothing less than a promise to history.

We gather here today to commemorate the courage of the 22,000 freedom fighters who defied tyranny and chose freedom instead. We gather here today to commemorate those throughout the world who have similarly struggled to escape terrorism and torture, those who continue the struggle for freedom. We commemorate and pay homage to the millions who have died to preserve freedom.

It is fitting and proper that we observe Freedom Day. May we be encouraged and inspired to go forth from this spot as the spark of a great crusade to free the world of enslavement and oppression. The valor of these 22,000 Chinese and Korean prisoners will remain forever an inspiration to those who cherish freedom.

The eyes of the world are today focused on the Far East. For, as Abraham Lincoln said with reference to my own country, the world cannot continue half slave and half free. And it is here, in the Far East that the question is today being most sharply asked—will men be free or be slaves? It is here that the answer is being most plainly given. Men will be free.

It will not be easy—and there is no reason to think that it will be quick—for freedom faces a massive challenge in Asia, a challenge led by those as determined as they are evil. There will be disappointments, frustrations, and setbacks in the future as there have been in the past. But men will be free.

They will be free because the determination on the side of freedom is inexhaustible—and you are the proof of that. They will be free because the resources of the side of freedom are more than sufficient and the will to use those resources is as firm as rock.

Let no one be in any doubt about the commitment of the United States to the cause of freedom in Asia. The propaganda from Hanoi and Peiping expresses the constant hope that the determination of the United States will weaken, that the effort of the United States will falter. They are engaging in a dangerous delusion if they believe their own propaganda. They are making the fatal mistake of tyrants when they misinterpret a freeman's love of peace. Love of peace does not mean that we will meekly submit to tyranny. Love of peace does not mean that we will purchase it at the cost of freedom—ours or anyone else's. As President Johnson said earlier this month in his state of the Union message, "We do not intend to abandon Asia to conquest."

The Far East is the key area of the world geographically, economically, and politically. If totalitarianism should conquer the Far East, then all of Asia would fall. With Asia in Communist hands, Africa would be conquered. Western Europe would be outflanked and the forces of freedom would be in grave peril.

In Asia there are vast untapped resources of manpower, rubber, tin, oil, and uranium. These resources, under the control of Communist aggressors, would be used for conquest and war. These resources, under Communist control, would not be used for peace or enlightment, for improved health and education. Under Communist control these vast resources would not be used for the advancement of freedom. They would be used for war and enslavement.

May I remind you that the Communist aggressors consider the individual as mere grains of sand on the seashore to be used by the masters of tyranny for their own selfish aggrandizement. We believe man is created in the image of an all-powerful being. We believe that man has individual rights and aspirations, that he is entitled to dignity and individual liberty. This we believe. This we will defend.

Lenin is reported as having said the road to Paris is the road through Peiping. The Communists are ruthlessly liquidating the opposition and are proceeding on that road to Paris by way of southeast Asia, the Near East and northern Africa. To halt this blueprint for tyrannical power, conquest, and enslavement, the United States is spending is blood and wealth in South Vietnam The United States manifested its devotion to the cause of freedom by expending the flower of its young manhood to defend that cause in Korea.

Our Commander in Chief, President Lyndon B. Johnson, is very wisely supporting with strength the freedom fighters in South Vietnam. President Johnson will not preside over the liquidation of freedom in Asia. He will instead preside over the restoration of freedom in Asia. He is a determined leader in the tradition of the Founding Fathers of my country. By his courageous action, President Johnson has encouraged people throughout the world who are devoted and dedicated to the cause of freedom.

We support you, here in the Republic of China, with our wealth and with our armed might. Your struggle for freedom is ours. We will not withdraw and leave you to fight this battle alone. We are here to stay until freedom is secure in Asia and the aggressor collapses in his own evil structure.

In the history of the struggle for freedom you have produced one of the giant figures of our time. General Chiang Kai-shek was among the first to understand the diabolical tactics and sinister designs of the Communist world conspiracy. He began his heroic struggle to oppose communism on the mainland in the 1920's, and he has been a world-renowned champion in that struggle from that time to this. He and Madame Chiang long ago won the hearts of the American people and of freedom lovers everywhere. Madame Chiang is now in my country, and we welcome her both as a valiant ally and as a warm and honored friend.

The Republic of China stands ready on the flank of Communist aggression. The Republic of China is blocking the road of Communist expansion to the islands of the Pacific. The Republic of China and the magnificent forces of the Republic of South Korea are a deterring force to the announced Communist plans to conquer India, southeast Asia, and move into the Middle and Near East. I salute you for this magnificent contribution to world freedom.

I salute you also for the assistance you are giving to the free world effort in Vietnam. You are one of the almost 40 nations which are helping the gallant people of that beleaguered land build a better life at the same time that they defend themselves against a cruel aggression. Your country is giving assistance in the field of agriculture. You have built power stations. You have sent medical teams. You have trained more than 400 Vietnamese technicians. You have given warehouses, agricultural equipment, seeds and fertilizers, veterinary equipment and cattle, boats, airplanes, and over half a million textbooks. And you have been generous in extending to our forces fighting in Vietnam both material facilities and hospitality. You are playing your full role as part of the fraternity of freemen opposing aggression in Vietnam.

The United States is fighting in South Vietnam as a member of that fraternity of freemen. We are fighting there against stark Communist aggression by terrorism, infiltration, sabotage, deception, and murder—the most diabolical and dangerous form of aggression. We are fighting in South Vietnam to preserve the right of self-determination of nationalities. We are fighting for peace, as opposed to the spread of war. We are fighting to help all of you in a righteous cause. We are fighting to prevent a world war. We are fighting to prevent a world holocaust of unparalleled carnage and destruction.

We are daily growing stronger on land, on sea, in the air, and in space. This strength is for freedom. This military might is dedicated to your independence, to your liberty. It will never be used for aggression, slavery, and conquest. The United States has no territorial designs anywhere in the world. We are for liberty and individual dignity and freedom for peoples everywhere. We believe in lending a helping hand to the diseased and the underprivileged throughout the world.

We are standing beside all of you in this struggle for freedom to preserve your ancient heritage, your art, your culture—which precedes ours—to preserve your civilization, which began thousands of years before ours. We share your hopes and your aspirations for the future. In this age of science and astronautics, there is no room for Communist suspicion, hatred, bigotry, and deceit. I look to the future with hope and with confidence. I believe we are on the dawn of a new era.

The magnificent progress made on this island shows what free societies can accomplish. The growth in your production of both agricultural and industrial goods can only be described as startling. Your exports are rising, your economy is strong, your currency is sound. Most important of all, the benefits of this prosperity are going to the people. I am proud that my country has assisted you in your efforts. And I know that you are proud that through your own efforts you have done so well that in your country we have been able to end our foreign aid program.

The iron curtain in Europe and Asia is a manifestation of an inferiority complex. The iron curtain is necessary to hide tyranny and promote totalitarianism. The Iron Curtain is designed to keep people from knowing the truth—to prevent them from knowing the joys of freedom and self-determination of peoples, individual liberty, dignity, and economic opportunity.

I can assure you that the United States will stand firm throughout the world. We fought in Korea. We are fighting in Vietnam. We are with you here. We were with you in Korea, in Quemoy, and in Matsu. We are supporting SEATO in southeast Asia and NATO in Europe. We will oppose Communist aggression wherever it rears its ugly head.

The time has come to launch an offensive—an offensive of truth about freedom, the truth about stark Communist aggression and its sinister designs. We must offer hope for the captive peoples of the world to throw off the yoke of tyranny and again live in the sunlight of freedom. We must spread the truth, throughout the world, about Communist imperialism and colonialism. We must tell the truth about class hatred and race prejudice of Communist imperialists—the truth about their liquidations, murder, and deceit.

We must not reward Red Chinese aggression by giving Red China a seat in the United Nations. We must not dignify Red China by giving her a forum and a vote on the cause of freedom. We must not bolster her economic system with the trade of free nations and peoples dedicated to the cause of human dignity. It would be a grave mistake to bolster her sagging economy with the products of free enterprise nations. We must not make this same mistake again. The free nations of the world promoted trade with the dictators of World War II. It was their acquisition of products from free enterprise nations that largely enabled them to launch a war against private enterprise, property rights, dignity, and freedom of the individual. We cannot make this mistake again. Red China has the atomic bomb. She is perfecting the hydrogen bomb. Trade with the free world will enable her to have the hydrogen bomb, with which to launch an onslaught against civilization, in mass production at an early date. We must push our freedom offensive now.

Captive nations and peoples hold the key to the future security, independence, and freedom of the world. Remain steadfast in your struggle for freedom. Captive nations are the "Achilles heel" of Red imperialist aggression. Communism fears your yearning, your desire for freedom. Communism fears your courage and your ability to someday rise and turn back the tide of tyranny.

You have our hearts. You have our sympathy, our support, and our understanding. We share your hopes. We share your aspirations. Most of all, we share your sure and certain vision of the future: Men will be free.

Misuse of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Jack Bird, who is a member of the Alaska Fishemen's Union, has posed some serious questions and charges pertaining to our foreign aid program in the Republic of Chile.

Following one of the major earthquakes in Chile, the U.S. foreign aid program was stepped up to aid in the recovery from this major disaster. However, it seems that this aid and subsequent aid, according to Mr. Bird's memorandum, has not been allowed to filter down to those who were in greatest need. Charges of graft and corruption have often been voiced in this area and there is no valid reason why we should not establish rules for administering foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, the American public cannot be placated forever with pious answers and doubletalk which has no substance of meaning.

I have asked that the following memorandum from Mr. Bird be investigated by the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Also, I am sending a copy of this memorandum to the officials of the CARE program so that they, too, may have the opportunity to look into the matter of CARE packages being sold, thus not reaching the poor.

Mr. Speaker, with the thought that my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD might be interested in Mr. Bird's observations I include herewith the text of his memorandum:

I would like you to take this matter up with interested parties, regarding aid donated by the American people.

In 1960, I was living in Coronel, south of Concepcion, Chile, in a very poor section. The industry is mostly coal mining and the wages were very low. While I was there we had the largest earthquake in Chilean history. Here in America the quake made headlines in all the newspapers and there were vast sums of money and materials donated for that area, which was the center of the quake. I resided in that area for 3 months after the quake. And I didn't see any sign of materials or aid that were supposed to be donated for relief of the victims. When I left Chile, people were still camping in front of their ruined houses. Hundred of thousands of people never knew of any aid. Where does this aid go?

Four years later I was again living in Chile. This time in the north, in the small city of Iquique where I resided for 18 months. At various times, I have seen CARE packages on display in the store for sale. I purchased 8 kilos of flour for 3½ escudos, nearly $1. In the 18 months that I lived in Iquique, I never met anyone who had ever received a CARE package and there are hundreds of thousands of poor people there. They didn't even know such a thing existed.

If we don't supervise the aid after it enters these countries, we are wasting our time and money.

I think this is a job for our highly rated Peace Corps in those areas. It would at least give them something useful to do. I have worked in many areas where the Peace Corps people are stationed and only about 25 percent are qualified to contribute anything to these areas, such as doctors, nurses, teachers and skilled technicians—the rest are just there for 2 years.

Example. I have seen pictures in magazines showing Peace Corps workers digging ditches in Latin America, when those people have known how to do that for 500 years.

Also, two Peace Corps workers came to Iquique, age about 20, to teach fishing. When they got on a fishing vessel, they were lost; they had to learn from the Chilean crew members, much to the amusement of the Chileans.

There are more Communists in Chile than I have seen anywhere else where I have worked. Most of the crew members that I instructed in fishing were Communist. Allende, the Communist Party leader, gained in most depressed areas of Chile. And if we don't get to these poorer classes of people in the next 4 years, the Communist Party has a good chance of getting in.

Therefore we must make sure we get credit for every dollar in aid we send there.

I think that is where the Peace Corps would come in useful, to see that anything we send to these countries gets to where it is supposed to go.

A national drive for good used clothing would be very welcome to these poor people. Nearly all American families have closets full of clothing they will never use again because they are tired of them. This material could be distributed by the workers of the Peace Corps, to be sure it gets to the right people.

My information is that aid donated by the American people is delivered to the principal port in each country, and then trusted to some local agency which may or may not be honest.

As an American taxpayer, I want to see us get full value for each dollar spent.

JACK BIRD, *Seattle, Wash.*

Concurrent Resolution of Michigan State Legislature Supporting President Johnson's Position on Vietnam Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD House Concurrent Resolution 40, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan, in support of President Johnson's position on the Vietnam issue:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 40

Concurrent resolution supporting President Johnson's position on the Vietnam issue

(Offered by Representatives Burton and Marshall)

Whereas the United States has for many years been committed to a definite policy in southeast Asia, which policy has declared intentions of the United States to support those governments of southeast Asia who are fighting communism; and

Whereas this policy has been supported by the two preceding Presidents of the United States as well as having such policy continued by the Johnson administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate hereby declare their firm belief and faith in President Johnson's policy in South Vietnam and southeast Asia and urge him to resist all tempting offers to negotiate a settlement which would be detrimental to the Government of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the legislature respectfully urge the President of the United States to continue with his cautious but firm policy in matters involving southeast Asia and that the great majority of the peoples of this country heartily support the position being taken by his administration and the majority of the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to President Johnson and to the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress for their consideration.

Adopted by the house December 9, 1965.
Adopted by the senate December 9, 1965.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLES,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The Weaver Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, more than two-thirds of all Americans are city and suburban dwellers.

In a real sense, the job of the Federal Government is now concerned with the care of the people in these areas.

The job facing the newly appointed head of the Department of Housing and Urban Affairs, the very able Robert C. Weaver, is a tremendously important one. His new Department must become the clearinghouse for urban and suburban problems.

A recent editorial in the New York Times calls this appointment "the beginning of another road along which vast new strides must be taken toward better living conditions."

I respectfully requested that the Times editorial on Dr. Weaver's appointment be included in the RECORD, and commend it to the reading of the membership of this body:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 15, 1966]

THE WEAVER APPOINTMENT

President Johnson's appointment of Robert C. Weaver as Secretary of the new Department of Housing and Urban Renewal has been long expected.

A Harvard-trained economist, Dr. Weaver hav Government experience dating from the early days of the Roosevelt administration. He is dedicated and knows the field to which he has been assigned; he was deputy State housing commissioner and later New York State Rent Administrator under Governor Harriman. President Kennedy subsequently named him to the top housing post in the country. He has attained Cabinet level—first Negro in American history to do so—despite some criticism of his abilities and his imagination.

If the appointment of Robert Weaver to his new post is the end of the road in the sense that the struggle to put a Negro in the Cabinet is won, so is it the beginning of another road along which vast new strides must be taken toward better living conditions. "In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods containing as many as a hundred thousand people," the President said in his state of the Union message. "Working together, private enterprise and government must press forward with the task of providing homes and shops, parks and hospitals, and all the other necessary parts of a flourishing community where our people can come to live the good life." It is Robert Weaver's task to direct and coordinate such an ambitious effort, and we wish him the best of luck in this monumental job.

Eccles Speaks Out on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the continuing efforts by the President to seek a negotiated peace in South Vietnam, for which I am most grateful, and the pressure which he is undoubtedly being subjected to from many persons advocating total victory, I think we would all do well to note the recent words by Financier Marriner S. Eccles. I would like to request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times, January 4, 1966, wherein Mr. Eccles joins in urging that we not escalate the war in Vietnam:

FINANCIER ASSERTS UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ESCALATE WAR

SAN FRANCISCO.—"Under no circumstances should we escalate the war in Vietnam. Our position there is indefensible," says financier Marriner S. Eccles.

Eccles declares, "Contrary to Government propaganda, we were not invited by and have no commitment to any representative or responsible Government of South Vietnam.

"We are there as an aggressor in violation of our treaty obligation under the U.N. Charter."

Eccles' remarks appeared in the "Letters to the Editor" column of the Monday morning edition of the San Francisco Chronicle.

Now 75, Eccles was assistant to the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury in 1934 and has held several positions on the Federal Reserve Board.

U.S. ACTION CITED

Eccles said that after the Vietnamese victory over the French and the signing of the Geneva Treaty in 1954, the U.S. refused to allow free elections in Vietnam, "knowing that Ho Chi Minh, the Communist leader of the north, was so popular he would unquestionably win."

"The South Vietnamese Catholics, about 10 percent of the population, property owners, and business interests in the large cities, are the strong anti-Communist supporters of South Vietnam, and are the minority," he continued.

"We have provided large amounts of military and economic aid and supplied them with military advisers," Eccles said. "But until the present administration came into office, we did not furnish American troops to help fight their war, until it was apparent they were being defeated.

"We have gradually taken over the direction to their Government as well as their war until now it has become an American war rather than a Vietnamese war."

As a result, Eccles said, "we now have alined against us the powerful countries of China and Russia, including all the Communist world, with practically no support from the rest of the world in spite of Rusk's and McNamara's recent appeals to NATO.

"Under these conditions," he concluded, "we cannot win."

World Is a Small One for Harriman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, world leaders have continued to be amazed at the vitality and effectiveness of one of our most able Ambassadors, Gov. W. Averell Harriman. Governor Harriman's familiarity with the principal world figures for more than a generation has assured his missions a friendly and respectful welcome wherever he goes.

Yesterday, Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post reported on an interview with the Governor following his most recent peace mission regarding the situation in Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to include Mr. Roberts' article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 23, 1966]

WORLD IS A SMALL ONE FOR HARRISON

(By Chalmers M. Roberts, Washington Post staff writer)

In the dark of last Wednesday evening W(illiam) Averell Harriman, who will be 75 next November 15, ran down the ramp from his presidential jet at Andrews Air Force Base in nearby Maryland. It was the end of yet another talking trip.

Harriman has been talking straight talk to presidents, prime ministers, dictators, and other assorted political potentates since Harry Hopkins introduced him to the Roosevelt inner circle in early New Deal days.

For 22 days he zigzagged around the world as one of President Johnson's peace offensive envoys. Mr. Johnson put a lot of people into diplomatic orbit but somehow the memory fades of all but the extraordinary durable Harriman.

For Harriman the only word is extraordinary. On this 35,000-mile trip he touched down in 12 world capitals—he was in Bangkok 3 times—and none of them was new to him. Not only had he been to them all before but he had met every one of the leaders before with the single exception of Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser.

GREETED BY MENZIES

That wealth of experience clearly paid dividends. Australia's Robert Menzies, who came out to the airport in the late evening to greet him, was an old friend from World

War II days in London when the Aussie sat with the British War Cabinet.

Or take Yugoslavia's President Tito.

"I saw him in Brdo"—where they met again this time—"back in 1951 when Yugoslavia, after the break with Russia, feared Stalin would turn the satellites loose on him. We gave him planes and tanks."

Harriman paused and added: "When you've seen a man in his tough times, there's a certain relationship."

In Warsaw, Communist Party Boss Wladislaw Gomulka saw Harriman "for old time's sake." He once had been a house guest in Harriman's New York residence, years after they first met during the war.

"The Shah of Iran," says Harriman, "considers me one of his oldest friends. He stayed at my cottage in Sun Valley." Harriman, whose father created the Union Pacific Railroad, was of course the man who created that ski resort.

Harriman has a newspaperman's instincts about travel and he hasn't missed many corners of the world.

"If you haven't been to a country," as he puts it, "no matter how much information you have, you can't get a feel of it."

In fact Harriman feels so strongly about the right of Americans to travel that he once hired Dean Acheson to fight a potential case for him right up to the Supreme Court. Back in the Eisenhower years, when he had finished a term as Governor of New York (he was involuntarily retired by the voters in favor of Nelson Rockefeller) Harriman decided he wanted to go to Communist China.

THE 1959 TRIP CALLED OFF

At that time the State Department forbade such trips. But the test case never came off because at the last minute he received a message from Peiping saying it would not be convenient to receive him that year, 1959.

Of course, Harriman has been to China. He stopped off in Chungking, the wartime capital, to see Chiang Kai-shek en route home from Moscow in 1946. Everybody told him he ought to go on to Peiping but he had a date with Gen. Douglas MacArthur in Tokyo, and so he missed his only chance to get the feel of today's center of the Asian Communist world.

"I was very serious in those days," he says with a sense of regret that he didn't put off the visit with the general another day or two to take in Peiping.

The Governor—everybody calls him that and he loves it despite the fact that his political skills turned out to be in an almost totally inverse ratio to his diplomatic abilities—had only 8 hours' warning of his latest trip. President Johnson called him at noon and he was airborne from Andrews at 8 p.m.

But the Governor was not unprepared this time even though he thought it was to be a trip of only a few days.

"I've been caught several times before," he explains, "on being sent to the tropics. So I usually take some tropical shirts along. I only wear one weight of wool suit anyway."

Although the presidential jet, with its huge "United States of America" legend emblazoned on each side, has a pair of bunks, the 6-foot-1-inch Harriman spent only 3 or 4 nights aboard in bed. At each stop, too, embassy wives reached for the soiled shirts and returned them in time for the Governor and his two globe-girdling aids, Asian Communist expert David Dean, and Christopher Squire, who is in charge of Hungarian affairs at State.

Harriman took no secretary. He penciled his dispatches on a yellow pad and got them off at the next stop. Dean and Squire alternated as note takers at the talks with the foreign leaders and then wrote up the detailed reports.

Harriman has his own philosophy about diplomatic messages.

"I write them short to the President and and the Secretary of State. More people read the short ones. But I make them very much to the point. They have got to be reasonably entertaining. I learned that from the British. They pass around the Cabinet table the telegrams they get from their ambassadors. They never have a leak, either; I wish we could do as well.

"The Ambassador in Britain who writes the best has his career made. They have literary style. Sometimes exact reporting is not as important as being descriptive."

Harriman, of course, won't discuss the substance of his peace mission other than to say that "I got the impression that all the people I saw were anxious to see the fighting stop, although for differing reasons."

"The crocodile" method is to come to the point and wrap it up quickly. He had 45 minutes at the Peshawar airport with Pakistan's President Ayub Khan who, naturally, he has known since 1959.

IN WARSAW AT 3:30 A.M.

When he arrived in Warsaw, nonstop from Andrews, it was 3:30 in the morning by his wristwatch. But 45 minutes after the touchdown he was closeted with Poland's Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki.

"You can do an awful lot in an hour," he says.

Harriman, of course, was acutely conscious of the critical role the Sino-Soviet dispute plays in the war in Vietnam. Like other administration leaders, he feels that Moscow wants to see the war ended, that Peiping wants to see it continue and that Hanoi is trapped in between the two Communist giants.

It was Harriman, after the German surrender and before Japan fell, who inspired James Forrestal to write in his 1945 diary: "He said the outward thrust of communism was not dead and that we might well have to face an ideological warfare just as vigorous and dangerous as fascism or nazism." And that at a time when most Americans were putting their postwar hopes on a continuation of the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union.

Stalin himself confirmed Harriman's dire views that October when he told him that "we've decided to go our own way."

It was President Kennedy who first deeply involved Harriman in the Far East, especially in the China problem. Today he takes very seriously the hard words from Peiping such as Lin Piao's pronouncement that the underdeveloped nations of the "countryside" will surround and defeat the "cities" of North America and Western Europe.

He wants Americans to fully appreciate the danger from China. But he does not worry that in turning their eyes to the Far East they will be bemused into thinking that Washington and Moscow are about to become allies. He figures the Russians will make it evident it can't come to that.

Averell Harriman did not bring peace to Vietnam but he clearly enjoys the satisfaction of yet another job well done. The trip was tiring; a cold turned into an ear infection because of too-rapid descent and change in the cabin air pressure coming into Darwin, Australia.

Winging home across the Pacific, he played bridge with Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Senator John Sherman Cooper, Dean, Squires, and Rush's aid, C. Arthur (Buck) Borg. Rusk, who had joined up in New Delhi and and who lives on his earnings, picked up a bit of change from Harriman who in 1952 was reputed to be worth $40 million.

When they got to Honolulu and the luxury of the Royal Hawaiian Hotel, Harriman ducked into a sports shop, bought a $6.95 pair of wildly yellow swimming trunks and headed into the sea at Waikiki.

There was no surfboarding this time. But he mused to a companion: "In my day, it was much more dangerous; they didn't have that stabilizing fin on the back of the board then."

George Paul Miller: The Conscience From California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker. It has been my rare privilege during the last 7 years to know and to work with Congressman George P. Miller, on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Under his leadership the committee has considered the National Aeronautics and Space Administration authorization bills which have brought the country's space programs from very preliminary stages to full operation. Much credit for this successful achievement is due to Chairman Miller's knowledge and patience and parliamentary skill.

The magazine Challenge published by the General Electric Missiles and Space division recently printed an article about Congressman Miller. So that our colleagues can have the opportunity to read this excellent portrayal, I include it in the Appendix of the Congressional Record:

GEORGE PAUL MILLER: THE CONSCIENCE FROM CALIFORNIA

(One of the first things a boy learns on getting a drum is that he's never going to get another one. One of the first things a nation learns about getting a George Miller is that we need more like him. The capable chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics relies on experience and commonsense in encouraging the Nation's space efforts. Here he speaks out on competition—among people, in industry, and with Russia.)

In a highly technical world like space, saturated with semantics like thermodynamics, gravity gradient, and accelerometers, if you were going to handpick a man in Government to head up the House of Representatives Committee on Science and Astronautics, you wouldn't pick the manager of a travel agency that failed, or a man who was on relief in depression days, or an ex official of a State fish and game commission.

You wouldn't, that is, unless the combination of all three turned out to be George Paul Miller, Congressman from California's 8th District, now in his 11th term in Washington, just shy of his 75th birthday, and still building momentum in a life he waited so long to begin.

And you might pick him for this job of spearheading the annual authorization of America's $5 billion space program not because of his technical background (though he's an engineer and has learned the language); not because he's a tactful politician (though associates say he can settle disputes better than most), and not because of his experience (though he's served five Presidents).

You pick George Miller because he's a trustworthy guardian of the public investment; because he asks questions until he gets answers we can all understand, and because he's dedicated to the idea that America will not ride on the back of the space bus, clinging to the teasing tail of Russian achievement.

"We all know that this Nation has the brainpower to continue the technical leadership we've always enjoyed," he said. "It's essential that we achieve unquestioned superiority in every aspect of space exploration, because of the knowledge to be gained, the security potential, and the economic value of applying what we learn to the way we live."

OUTSPOKEN AND QUALIFIED

Assigned to the committee in 1959, Congressman Miller backgrounded himself carefully in many phases of the space business before ascending to the chairmanship in 1961. An outspoken endorser of the space program, he's quick to call attention to its widespread importance:

"By any standard, this Nation's space program is a massive enterprise, in terms of money and human resources. Since it opened its doors for business a few years ago, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has received approximately $22 billion in appropriations.

"More than 90 percent of this money is spent for contracts with industry and this means that about 300,000 people are working on NASA programs. If you accept the rule of thumb that there are 6 people—the butcher, the grocer, the real estate man, etc.—serving the needs of each of these individuals, then approximately 2 million people are benefitting indirectly from NASA payrolls.

"Do we spend too much? Hardly. In my first year as chairman, the House endorsed the appropriation by a vote of 343–0 and the support since has been just as impressive. Actually, the Soviet Union spends much more on its space program in relation to its gross national product than we do. We are not paying anywhere near the price for our space exploration that is being paid by the average Soviet citizen. He is paying in terms of less bread on his table, lower quality shoes on his feet, and poorer housing for himself and his family.

"I have little patience with the critics who cry out that our tax money is being thrown away in the exploration of space, or that going to the moon will result in the neglect of our problems here on earth.

"It should be obvious to those critics, if they take the time for a short historical review, that many years of experience have shown that the indirect payoff in human terms for technical innovation is many times more valuable than the original investment.

"The benefits to all of us from space research are spectacular. I can see it in communications, in weather prediction, in navigation, in education. But I can also understand why the average housewife, or the Texas cattleman, or the Iowa farmer, or the California fisherman finds it difficult to relate earth satellites or deep space probes to personal economic welfare.

"What we must understand is that any national effort such as our space program will directly affect every aspect of our national community and will have an impact on nearly every individual."

George Miller will be 75 years young in January. Experience autographs his face. It's a face that has a lived-in look. He entered politics when he was near 50 because he "was too old to get into anything else." Sometimes he's known more problems than votes.

But Miller realizes that problems are the price of progress. He's proudest of his "good fortune to have been born in America."

It's an America that saw George Miller win his degree as a civil engineer in 1912, practice engineering for 5 years, then enter World War I as a lieutenant in the field artillery. In the early 1920's he spent 4 years on the staff of the U.S. Veterans Bureau, forerunner of the current Veterans' Administration. Then in 1925, he returned to the practice of civil engineering.

With a friend he became coowner in 1928 of a travel agency which failed during the depression ("We just hung on too long, thinking things would get better, and pretty soon we were broke"). Miller was thrown on relief, and began sweeping streets in the city of Alameda, Calif. When you're nearing 40 and sweeping streets in northern California, it takes a pretty healthy brand of optimism to predict that in about 10 years you'll be in Congress.

"I had a lot of time to do some thinking back then," he recalls. "I had always been interested in politics. I had some friends and they helped me to run for the State assembly in California. You only needed $20 and 20 names to run. I announced, and I won, and things began to happen."

Things not so much happened, as he made them happen. He was more than just a politician who favored motherhood, green grass, and an early spring. A distinguished 4 years in the assembly led to an appointment as executive secretary of the California Fish and Game Commission ("having interest in neither the commercial nor the sportsman aspects, I was considered just right for the job").

THE WASHINGTON ARENA

In 1944 voters sent George Miller to Washington and his congressional credentials have grown ever since. He's worked on civil service, immigration, irrigation, post office matters, and in more recent years on Congress' stake in the Nation's scientific activities.

"It must be remembered that the responsibility for direct congressional judgments with regard to research and development to a great degree depends upon the knowledge and wisdom of comparatively few men. Members of Congress, because of the wide variety and diverse nature of their responsibilities to the people they represent and to the country at large, are able to develop real depth in very few areas. They must rely on committees.

"About 2 years ago, I established a Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. It's the job of this subcommittee to concern itself with analyzing Government support of research and development, and to help evaluate how efficienctly those programs are satisfying Government needs.

"Congress has been thoroughly aware over the past 20 years that human problems were arising within our steadily increasing population that had to be resolved through technological solutions.

"In view, however, of the very nature of research, and its obvious need to maintain a rate of progress that would satisfy our national needs, Congress has been very careful not to set up criteria through legislation that would inhibit scientific investigations. We're here to encourage a research climate that will lead to practical benefits for all of us.

"I'm especially pleased at the boon education has received. The NASA budget for example, included $46 million last year for grants and fellowships. In achieving a vigorous, healthy society, well-balanced between technology and culture, between science and the arts, and between material achievement and philosophy, we must continue to stimulate our educational resources. Nothing is more important to our future."

George Miller's confidence in America's system of competition between companies and between people has never been higher. He feels it's the kind of competitive picture that makes this Nation an *odds-on favorite* in space competition with Russia.

"The Soviet launching of Sputnik I in October of 1957 was a political factor of the first magnitude. Its implications, international and domestic, were enormous.

"We had to face the grim reality that Russia had achieved a totally *surprising* technological breakthrough that we could not then come close to matching. We should now derive great satisfaction from the fact that engineering and science, which have been daring and confident, have made our comeback space program so successful.

"In this Nation of doers and hardworking people, engineering in the hands of private enterprise has provided the tools with which the American people have been able to transform in 180 years a wilderness into the most powerful Nation in history and to create through technology an unprecedented superabundance of human benefits.

"It is a significant expression of our national spirit and courage, that we stand unafraid to invite the people of the world to be witnesses to the successes—and failures—of our space scientists and engineers.

"From the start we have recognized that an accelerated space program designed solely to serve military ends would be very limited scientifically, and would place a severe burden on the resources, both human and material, of the Department of Defense.

"For these reasons, and more, the congressional committee, as a basic premise, first declared that the exploration of space for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all mankind was to be our national goal. This was wisely written into the 1958 Space Act.

"Certainly what's happening out in space is getting the attention of the world, but the promise from this adventure extends far beyond our success in space. We can apply some of what we learn to our problems right here on earth. Let me cite four problem areas which face this Nation at the present moment.

"There's beach erosion. We're losing many of our finest beaches. There's pollution of the air and water. There's a misuse in the consumption of water, not only in this Nation, but around the world. There are immense problems in communications.

"The point of all this is that much of what we learn in space exploration can be applied to all of these very real problems. I think some of the work being done in my home State of California is a good indicator of things to come. There aerospace engineers are seeking to solve problems in education, waste disposal, transportation, the State penal system and in other earthly matters.

"We must push on without hesitation. Mankind has survived in the past through his intimate knowledge of the environment in which he has had to live and with which he has had to contend. This is as necessary today as it has ever been. We must learn as much about space, our solar system, and our galaxy as is possible.

"Who, in the light of historical evidence, would dare presume now that mankind need not extend its investigation of the space environment?"

For 21 years George Miller's wife, Esther, has been his secretary. It started out of financial necessity. It continues out of success. Miller is not a rich man, but he likes his job and says it pays well.

His personal fund of experience, his understanding of people, and his appreciation of America, are admired by many, equaled by few. In World War I, in working with veterans, in sponsoring legislation to aid victims of paralysis, in 21 years in Washington, the great common denominator has been his genuine interest and confidence in people.

Some people say George Miller got started too late. Others figure he came along just at the right time.

"The best thing you can do," he comments, "is to serve your country. You ought to be willing to make some sacrifices, take a little hell now and then, and keep right on working."

To him the exploration of space is more than an expression of national ego, more than a demonstration of technological superiority. He believes our national space program represents an obligation to our children and our traditions.

Chairman MILLER concludes: "Our space program is in the hands of men of outstanding ability and patriotism, whose driving motivation is to bend every effort possible to fulfill the guiding principle of the 1958 Space Act, that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefits of all mankind.

"I think the record shows that we have been true to our ideals."

Johnson Versus Malthus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, we are presently engaged in consideration of how best to assist several foreign governments to provide food for their peoples. We will send grain. With an eye to the long view we will help to improve agricultural methods. I agree entirely that these projects must be undertaken. However, with the words of President Johnson in mind—"Five dollars invested in population control is worth $100 invested in economic growth"—I wish to add the following corollary:

Family planning programs must be included in all our assistance programs—both foreign and domestic. The problem of feeding the present world population is staggering. Let us avoid as much as possible increasing the growth of human numbers so rapidly as to be unable to increase food production to meet their needs.

The following editorial from the New York Times of January 24, 1966, enlarges on this line of reason:

JOHNSON VERSUS MALTHUS

President Johnson envisages a sweeping cooperative effort to better conditions in the developing world. Citing the progress made under the point 4 program of technical assistance that began 17 years ago, Mr. Johnson has promised additional funds and other aid to developing nations willing to help themselves in combating illiteracy, disease, hunger and uncontrolled growth in population. It is time, he said in both the state of the Union message and in dedicating the Harry S. Truman Center for the Advancement of Peace, to "help improve the life of man."

This is a noble objective, meriting support from other rich industrialized countries as well as the United States. But there is a need for establishing a clear order of priorities. The President seems to be suggesting that the poor countries, having achieved a substantial degree of development, are now poised for a great leap forward to higher living standards. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Millions of the world's peoples are fighting a grim and losing battle for mere survival and many millions more are on the borderline between hunger and starvation.

If anything, the situation threatens to grow worse. Famine stalks the great subcontinent of India, where Government spokesmen predict that the food shortage will curtail the already inadequate diets of as many as 100 million people. Drought in Africa will mean increased deprivation—and rising tensions—in many newly emerging nations. Even in areas where food output is rising, the rapid growth in the number of mouths that must be fed has outstripped the additions to supply.

Because man must be fed before he can be educated, the highest priority must go to alleviating the hunger now so widespread. This effort requires a vast expansion in the campaign to control births and an accentuated effort to increase agricultural production throughout the developing world.

Even the immediate problem cannot nearly be met with the $1 billion that Mr. Johnson pledged for his new program. But should the President seek support for an amount more in keeping with both the needs of the developing world and the resources of the richest country on earth, there would still be a sizable gap. Other rich nations must contribute; and in any event multilateral aid is preferable to unilateral aid. And there is ample room for private initiative—by universities and foundations and business groups—which is sorely needed all over the developing world.

Helping the poor nations reach the stage where they can think in terms of improving the life of their peoples will be expensive—in time and effort as well as money. But it is no longer a question of whether it can be afforded. It is failure to do so that cannot be afforded. Mr. Johnson's dream of a better life cannot be realized in a world where the Malthusian specter, more terrible than Malthus ever conceived, is so near to being a reality.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, January 22, over 1 million Ukrainian-Americans observed the anniversary of an event that holds great significance for them as well as for their fellow Americans. Forty-eight years ago, on January 22, 1918, the people of the Ukraine declared their independence. This act culminated a struggle that had been waged throughout the years of the 19th century and the early years of the 20th century. During those years of struggle, the people of the Ukraine consistently looked for encouragement and inspiration to a country that had earlier fought to free itself from colonial rule and had declared itself devoted to the cause of freedom and self-determination for others who remained oppressed. That country was the United States of America.

Today, Ukrainians everywhere lament that their homeland knew the blessings of liberty for only 2 brief years, that their country has fallen under the sway of an imperial power which has consistently exploited the riches of the Ukraine and has sought to stamp out Ukrainian nationalism. In America, Ukrainians who have been fortunate enough to escape Soviet tyranny and to participate in the life of a democratic society are especially moved by the plight of the people of their former homeland. Surely, their fellow Americans should be similarly moved. For today, as yesterday, all Americans remain committed to freedom and self-determination for peoples living under the yoke of foreign tyrannies. And today, as yesterday, Americans are dying on faraway battlefields as they give proof of that commitment. As we observe an anniversary that Ukrainians everywhere hold dear, we cannot forget that we thereby also affirm our dedication to principles cherished by all Americans.

What Is a Person?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, each one of us is constantly trying to bring into focus man's relationship between our scientific world and his spiritual existence and his beliefs on immortality. One of the most interesting and well written articles that has come to my attention in many years is an article entitled "What Is a Person," by Dr. Richard Aspinall. I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues. It is a contribution which I am sure will be most valuable to the reader.

The article follows:

WHAT IS A PERSON?

(Richard Aspinall, Ph. D., LL.D.)

In recent years there has been, particularly in the field of genetics and biochemistry, a phenomenal upsurge of efforts to analyze the self, or the person. Upon this topic, long shelves of books and innumerable articles have been written and painstakingly reviewed in scientific magazines. Television and radio programs have been shown and heard at attractive hours for the benefit of those desirous of scientific information. Consequently, there is little escape from reading, seeing or hearing the subject discussed. One is reminded of the hubbub fomented in lay circles by the theory of evolution, by the introduction of the Mendelian law into the study of heredity, by the results of psychologic tests and measurements of behaviors, and by the therapies and medications of psychology and psychiatry upon the mentally normal and the naturally advanced, as well as upon the defectives, dependents, and delinquents of society. And last but not least, are the almost frighteningly bold assertions made by physical science concerning the relationships of protoplasm and the genes to the origin and development of life, besides the continuous affirmation of the probable deciphering of the genetic code.

PURPOSE OF STUDY

Two questions are dominant in this study. First, how may the human race learn to understand more fully the procedures for improving the different selves that make up society? That is to say, who and what in a general sense is each individually different person and, more specifically, how may every mentally normal human being improve himself? It is axiomatic that the race will improve as each person in it improves. By our behaviors we lift up the world in which we live, or we pull it down. There is no claim advanced here that this approach to our subject is either original, or demonstratively scientific. Second, what can one do to understand more fully and continuously improve more wholesomely one's own self? Even though there have been millions upon millions of humans born and developed on this planet and doubtless there will be millions and more millions born and developed, I am, by definition, more concerned about my own status and my own future than I am about the rest of all humanity. This is neither a selfish nor a facetious remark. I have more equity in myself than I could possibly have in any, or all other persons. It might appear noble for anyone to claim he would be happy to annihilate himself for the good of humanity, but it is impossible for a person to obliterate himself. One may believe that he will be reincarnated, and possibly he may be, but when one's person is destroyed, he cannot assume possession of it again, no matter into what status he might be reborn. Christians believe that God, the Father Almighty, became incarnate and gave His Only Begotten Son to save the world from sin. Among Christians this doctrine is known as the Atonement, or At-one-ment between God and man. Those who believe this doctrine readily admit that no one can explain it; yet amid all the mystery, God, the Father did not destroy His identity nor permit Himself to become some other being in order to affect the Atonement. Every religionist believes in an atonement between God and man; otherwise, there would be no need of any religion that calls for an individual's worship of Deity.

IS MAN IMMORTAL?

If perchance on the one hand, man is only mortal and this life is the end for him, then our creation has not been an unqualified success. It would be most lamentable and an anticlimax if man has developed to where he now stands, only to have reached a cul-de-sac. I am virtually at the end of my sojourn on earth, and the situation appears all the more distressing to seniors if humans are biologically only mortal carriers in the eternal lifestream, whether we were created as such or brought into it by processes of evolution. On the other hand, if man is immortal as an individual, then his potentials are boundless and reasonable. Such a status would make all persons—at all times and in all places—much more interested in each other's welfare than if mankind were only mortal. The more important points are not how man came to be here, but why we were brought here, what we are destined to be, where we are meant to go, and whether or not the whole creation is under control.

We realize—whatever we are or may become—that we are, that we shall be, and that is that. There is no way to prove or disprove that the human race would fare better if its individual components were immortal; but personally, I am infinitely happier in believing that I, along with the incomprehensible number of people born since the beginning of time and all those yet to be born, have been created to live forever.

APPLICABLE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Genetics

An acceptable definition of genetics is that it is a study of heredity and the beginnings of life. The urge to procreate the human family has ever been part of us, but the articulation of the miracle of human birth into understandable language is not as old as the human race; yet it is as old as civilization. It is now common knowledge that human birth is produced by the act of cohabitation wherein an ovum of the female is impregnated by a sperm of the male, and that the thus fertilized ovum and the sperm become a single cell in the womb of the mother. In due course it was learned that, contemporaneous with conception, nothing is ever added to the single cell. Still later (relatively recently) it was discovered that the single cell has the ability to create, while in the womb, other molecules identical with those in itself. In short, all the anatomic and physiologic potentials are present in the initial constellation of molecules making up all the genes; or, by way of a crude analogy, all the giant oak trees come from the tiny acorn. The foremost project confronting the geneticists today is the explanation of how the vast complex of genes initiates and guides a definitely persistent species from the fertilized egg to the matured human being.

When this writer began to teach college genetics in 1915, the emphasis of the text we used were upon the application of the Mendelian Law, along with ample stress upon the dominants and recessives, as well as the routine arguments for and against the inheritance of acquired characteristics. One overall picture brought to the attention of the students was the necessity of having appropriately mated parents, if mentally and physically normal children were to be born—barring such exceptions as accidents at birth. The author of our text was Herbert E. Walter, professor of biology at Brown University, and the book was written in 1912. At that time reference books were scarce, so perforce we selected families from the general biologic literature (for example, the Jukes, the Kallikaks, and the descendants of Jonathan Edwards) and also interviewed whichever social groups were available to us. A most fruitful source of acceptable data came from a sizable colony of Negroes, American Indians and Caucasians, who lived together as a village community and were usually referred to locally as Guineas. This group of inhabitants was located only 20 miles from our college, so that our students had somewhat free access for talking to them, to study the low mentality, the weaknesses of uninhibited inbreeding, and the inherited poverty of these pitiable citizens. This mixed colony had been there for many generations and proved to be better ground for the study of eugenics than it was for genetics, but that was not deemed a drawback by the students in our course.

Many years were required for genetics, as a new course of study, to "win its spurs" and qualify as the stuff of which curricula are made, but educators know that such is the experience with all new subjects for which accreditment is sought towards a degree in a liberal arts college. But when genetics did come into its own, it did so with a great flourish. The news of discussing sex in classes 50 years ago in a church-supported coeducational college soon spread around—too far and too wide perhaps—but be it said that the sizes of our genetic class enrollments were governed each year by the available seats in our largest classroom.

The approach and attitude toward genetics have undergone numerous changes of late. The greatest impetus to the broadening of this science has been the varied experiments on the fruitfly, Drosophilia, since the 1930's. Presently, the genetics departments in colleges and universities are highly organized, adequately staffed, and enjoy up-to-date equipment for the testing of human, lower animal, plant, and all other forms of life. Moreover, genetic laboratories are now divisions of large commercially controlled research centers, and altogether this entire study demands and receives large budgets. It is easier as well as temporarily more satisfying to conduct tests and measurements in crossbreeding, leading to pure line species of plant and lower animal life, than it is to control similar tests and measurements among humans, with the inevitable result that this science as a teaching and experimentation subject has naturally been drawn into the agricultural colleges. In this connection West Virginia University, through its agricultural college, has recently released a press bulletin announcing the 50th anniversary of the discovery in that State of the Golden Delicious apple. The bulletin states that the Golden Delicious was known in 1912 only to the Porters Creek area of Clay County, and pomologists claim it is probably an offshoot of an oldtime apple known both as a Golden Reinette and as a Golden Russet. It is estimated that 24 million Golden Delicious trees have sprung from the original, and this new tree is now grown throughout Europe, South Africa, New Zealand, Tasmania, Canada, and the United States. Not even a remotely similar experiment could be consummated anywhere with human beings. It has been claimed that some controlled experiments were attempted by the Nazis among selected state personnel and female prisoners of World War II, but the scientific value was negligible because the whole project was an inhuman type of modified rape.

The study of genetics has wrought miracles in terms of exploring wide vistas of heredity, for which all scholars are very grateful; but it is a moot question whether or not we know more about persons by reason of experimentation with insects, plants and lower animals than we might learn about human beings by applying vigorous research to men, women and children. In the autumn of life it seems paramount to me to learn who I am in my own relation to the rest of the universe and to endeavor to learn where I am going as a traveler in this life, regardless of what my molecular condition was when I was born.

Biochemistry

An acceptable definition of this science is that it is a study of the chemistry of plant and animal life. The objectives at this point are to incorporate relevant data from biochemical research in terms of what mankind can do in helping people understand life better and to approximate who the individual is as a person. I am not a biochemist, but hasten to acknowledge my gratitude to personal acquaintances who are authorities in this field, for assistance in the selection of data for this article.

Biochemistry is definitely in the forefront of genetic research projects. Many eminent scholars in the subjects of mathematics, chemistry, and physics have turned their abilities to the exposure of the individual molecules of living organisms. Incidentally, the number of biochemists has increased stupendously in the past few years. An announcement in the New York Times, July 26, 1964, stated that the Sixth International Congress of Biochemistry would hold its first annual meeting in America this past summer. From the Soviet Union, France, Japan, Argentina, Israel, Great Britain, and from all parts of Canada and the United States, an attendance of 6,000 members was expected—including 15 Nobel laureates. There were 700 reports to be read in technical sessions, and an additional 1,100 research reports to be included in the books of abstracts for the reading public. Among the subjects for discussion were the chemistry of life, the molecular dynamics of aging, heredity, natural resistance to disease, and the action of antibiotics against bacteria and tumors.

Biochemistry in its research projects has had most gratifying results, and every other science is constantly alerted to the progress being made. This science has already paved the way in large measure for a better understanding of a practical approach to the unsolved problems of heredity, but it savors of wishful thinking when enthusiastic scientists confidently predict that biochemistry holds the key to unlock all the secrets of life. The range of this article makes unnecessary anything more than a very limited review of the research, except as it may affect the beginings of life. It is common knowledge to the biology student that every person begins life as a cell, and that the most consequential part of the cell is the nucleus within which are the 46 chromosomes that are found in every mentally normal human being. In the chromosomes are the genes, which are the determiners in the chromosomes, each one being a protein molecule. The molecules are composed of atoms, and in the atoms are various ultimate particles—electrons, protons, mesons, and many others. Even energy may be broken down into very small units and quanta, a feature hardly relevant to our study.

The origin of life is completely unknown. When science analyzed the fertilized egg from which the human being emerges, it was learned that the center of control lies in protoplasm, the physical basis of all life. Protoplasm is defined by Edmund Sinnott of Yale University (in "Cell and Psyche," p. 19) as "a bridge anchored at one end in the simple stuff of chemistry and physics, but at the other end reaching far across into the mysterious dominions of the human spirit." This same author, in his "Biology of the Spirit," further states regarding protoplasm that it is a much more complicated study than biologists thought it was a generation ago, and that it is a complexity in physical structure, chemical composition, and physiologic activity far beyond former ideas on the subject. Protoplasm is not a random, indeterminate thing, but is the same all the way from the ameba to the fully developed human being; life has its basic physical problem in that remarkable natural system called protoplasm, and in this aggregation of proteins, watery, formless, and flowing, which is at once deceptive in its visible simplicity and amazingly complex in its ultimate organization, all the problems of living things are centered.

Another viewpoint is expressed in Reader's Digest for June 1964 (p. 198) by George Palade of the Rockefeller Institute, who stated that protoplasm is an elaborate structure within cells, that nature had already done most of her job when she evolved the cells, and that there was nothing more to be done except put the cells together as horses, elephants, birds, fishes, and even human beings. There are many other scientific evaluations of protoplasm. Although human life is the acme of creation, it is also the greatest of all mysteries. The door to useful information must never be closed to scientific research, and by the same token, every hypothesis is admissible to open discussion. In sum, it would seem undeniable that science has consummated with meticulous efficiency an analysis of the initial fertile cell which spells that life emerges from protoplasm, and that life's earliest known ingredients are chemical.

In this connection the most fantastic results have been the findings relating to DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid). These may be demonstrated best through the pertinent studies with X-rays. DNA was discovered about 1870, but has received the intense study of all sciences only since 1961, when Dr. Marshall Nirenberg and his associates in the National Institutes of Health, succeeded in partially breaking the genetic code, a four-letter alphabet of the molecular language. The current major problems for biochemistry and the other physical sciences are learning how to spell with the four letters of the code thus far broken, and therewith write the genetic messages about the secrets of life.

DNA is spiral in shape and crowded with thousands of coils. Its weight is only one ten-quadrillionths of an ounce, yet it contains sufficient coded information to assemble, by chemical processes, a full grown adult. Each DNA molecule has four basic chemicals—adenine, thymine, guanine and cytosine. Science confidently claims that heredity qualities stem exclusively from DNA. This specific acid never leaves the nucleus, but it assembles an assistant known as RNA to carry the necessary instructions to form protein in the cell. Both DNA and RNA are ribose acids, but DNA has one less oxygen atom in it than has RNA; hence they are respectively named deoxyribonucleic acid and ribonucleic acid. There is flawless cooperation between these two compounds. Nirenberg and his associates determined that RNA was employing an alphabet of 4 letters, under instructions from DNA, to make proteins out of 20 aminoacid building blocks, and these scientists were convinced that each amino acid had a specific RNA word for its own use. With this knowledge as a basis, they ultimately made a dent in the genetic code. Some enthusiasts have declared that when the genetic code is completely broken, this achievement will make, by comparison, the harnessing of the uranium atom appear very simple indeed.

Another slant on the DNA theory was proposed by Peter Fong, a Cornell University physicist, to the effect that twisted DNA can unwind. He told the American Physical Society in Washington, D.C. (as reported in the New York Times, May 3, 1964) that DNA molecules must unwind in order to transmit their messages; yet in some instances they are twisted together like a rope with as many as 20,000 turns. He elaborated by explaining that when the hydrogen bonds which hold the twist are broken, the coil tries to wind and unwind in the random manner of atoms and molecules; and when it cannot wind itself any tighter, it unwinds. The entire coil unwinds itself in less than a minute.

Still another viewpoint regarding DNA was expressed by A. S. G. Curtis, a biologist from London University, whose thesis was reviewed in Newsweek for January 6, 1964. The thesis maintained that DNA is not the only factor involved in the control of heredity; also that DNA may not even be in the picture at all. It may be that there are sources of data besides DNA that have direct bearing on the secrets of heredity; or perchance, the Curtis experiment may not have been thoroughly documented or correctly reported; or it may be an illustration of "one swallow does not make a summer."

Biochemists as well as other scientists have accepted the wise words of warning from F. B. Wilson in The Cell in Development and Inheritance (p. 670): "We cannot hope to comprehend the activities of the living cell by analysis merely of its composition * * * modern investigation has, however, brought ever increasing recognition of the fact that the cell is an organized system and one in which we must recognize some kind of organized structure, or organization." That is another way of stating that a living cell cannot be formed synthetically, now or later. The most significant problems of all living things are centered in man, for the living things are made of proteins and nucleic acids rather than of earth, dust and ashes, as some Christian funeral services are formulated to remind us.

Psychology and psychiatry

These two sciences will be discussed simultaneously at this point. The psychologists study the manifold ramifications of the mind, and the psychiatrists are psychologists who are graduates in medicine. Research in these areas has revealed immense amounts of dependable data in the analyses of behavior habits, and has plotted courses of action for the diagnosis, interpretations, and therapies in connection with mental and physical maladjustments of the person. Clinical and experimental research projects by educational, social, religious, child, abnormal, applied, and the rest of the psychologies, have not been with us very long. Time was, well within the memory of many, that the study of psychology was just becoming a requisite for a degree in philosophy. Older alumni will also recall that any given student had a decided edge on other debaters in their college literary societies, for instance, if he were a psychology major.

The phenomenal growth of psychology and psychiatry has been due largely to the substitution of experimental for clinical data. It would now require a sizable library to house all the scientifically documented material that has been published by psychologists, psychiatrists, and their affiliates, for the benefit of education, medicine, and all the other agencies of welfare and rehabilitation throughout the world. Probably the greatest social contribution of these two sciences has been to alert laymen to the necessity of consultation with experts regarding mental adjustments. At a recent meeting of the First International Congress of Social Psychiatry in London, England, Norman Brill spoke on the subject of divorce in that country; but the interesting phase of this news was not so much what was discussed, as that there existed a large organized International Congress of Social Psychiatry.

Sigmund Freud, 1856–1939, founded psychoanalysis. He and his associates, among whom were Adler, Yung, Brouer, Charcot, James, Ferenzi, and Watson, were the early luminaries who did the ground work in charting the movement for correct diagnoses and improved methods in the treatment of mental diseases. Every beginner in psychology soon learns of Freud's concept that the organization of the person is divided into three layers: the id, the ego, and the super-ego. Briefly, according to Freud, the id is influenced althogether by heredity; it exists at the unconscious level, and it embraces dynamic forces such as motives, urges, yearnings and instincts. The ego is reflected in the individual's conscious experiences in his ordinary mental processes. The super-ego acts as a judge, or conscience, over the ego. The super-ego also demonstrates the influential power of other persons over the individual. It may not be too far afield to bring into the discussion the findings of an unplanned questionnaire research carried out in some of my recent psychology classes. The record shows that from 55 papers submitted on the assignment, "Contributions of Sigmund Freud to Psychology," there were 41 which unreservedly stated that Freud was a most outstanding psychologist, and that his interpretations of dreams and the structure of the ego were the best of his contributions. These data are not offered as scientific evidence, nor are they the direct or indirect quotations from the instructor, but they do seem to reflect a sample cross-section of student opinion on Freud as an eminent research scholar.

Psychiatry and psychology involve the diagnosis and classification of behavior in the various types of mentally deficient, and prescribe the therapy most suitable to the needs of the patients. Both of these mental sciences also serve the public by preventive measures. In brief, just as a medical patient delays or prevents serious bodily ailments by consultation in ample time with his physician, so may a potential mental patient, by early consultation with mental experts, avoid the phases of psychosis.

GROUP EVALUATIONS

The foregoing are brief independent reviews of some comprehensive research projects on heredity and personality, studied by means of genetics, biochemistry, psychology, and psychiatry. It is now proposed to evaluate the same projects simultaneously in terms of how they are related, in whole or in part, as a group to the purport of this article. To be more specific, we shall pinpoint the areas in these four sciences that assist all citizens to live a better and fuller life, and that also alert me as an individual citizen in terms of who I am, and just where I may fit best into the scheme of things.

Biochemical research reveals that if an error obtains in a parent's DNA, a child of such a parent may not be able to make the efficient enzymes needed to regulate the essential reactions in the metabolism, and it is highly probable that such a child will inherit feeblemindedness. Also, if any 1 of the 20 amino acids—chemical building blocks that make protein—is out of alinement in any of the 574 possible combinations forming a hemoglobin molecule, the child inheriting such a maladjustment is prone to sickle-cell anemia. Another angle of this research reflects the fact that DNA carries the secrets of life, as its molecules are present in every living cell. DNA has the power to divide itself, thus forming new molecules like itself, and thereby ultimately amassing a phenomenal amount of knowledge that is termed the genetic code. This entire code must be an organized stockpile available inviolate for further use, or else disaster, chaos, disease, and death would result. It is not an accident that when we plant a coconut, we reap coconuts; nor do we expect to pick cherries from a mango tree, or lemons from a poinsettia bush.

The molecular biologists hopefully predict that if the work begun by Nirenberg in 1961 could be improved to the point of mastering the genetic code, messages could be sent to DNA for implementation; then the cure of many diseases, as well as the lengthening of the span of human life, would inevitably follow. It is admitted that the results already achieved are stupendous and verge on the miraculous, but careless predictions in this field, or in any other science, may meet at least three formidable barriers. First, the mastery of the genetic code and how it possibly can thwart the laws of metabolism may be more than we can expect, either presently or in the foreseeable future. A second barrier to an acceptable interpretation of predictions concerning the potential of the genetic code is its psychosomatic phases. There is constant strife regarding how the normal individual meets the miracle of death.

The question constantly arises concerning those who die a natural death as against an accidental or suicidal death, as to whether or not there will ever be a predictable law which determines the manner in which a person will be required to pass to "the great beyond." For instance, a tantalizing question is whether the body will remain healthy as the mind goes berserk, or whether the body will collapse as the mind remains active. A third barrier lies in the fact that human beings in general are unwilling to act as guinea pigs, in terms of permitting their sperm cells and ova to be under the control or at the disposition of science or any other outside agency. It is a matter of record, however, that only a relatively small number of females have willingly submitted to artificial insemination.

It has been speculated—possibly by journalistic feature writers—that certain blends of manufactured DNA fed to a person will improve, or even govern, his memory. Such statements may be shots in the dark, but the problem remains whether memory can be extended appreciably by consuming synthesized DNA. For instance, can human beings, by any manufactured processes, be conditioned to such a degree that they will remember anything about themselves at birth or as two-year-olds, or recall their own activities in this life when perchance they reach the next life? Every normal person agrees that experimental research should be continued as much as possible, and that any speculations which may tend to revolutionize generally accepted beliefs should be scientific in approach. By the same token, those who look to entelechies for solutions should also be realistic in approach, and not prone to use ridiculous analogies for evidence to substantiate their tenets. It is of no value to individual persons to be told by one group of researchers to hold to this or that theory, and at the same time be influenced by still another group which promotes opposing theories. Until the sciences interpret the documented data in terms of what a person is, then the varied and debatable conclusions are confounding. It is most essential that researchers delve more and more into understanding and clarifying the human element, and then relate it to the astounding revelations made daily by all kinds of studies pertaining to every facet of life.

The hypotheses regarding how DNA affects the healing of diseases, the prolongation of the lifespan, the length of memory, and the possibility of breaking the genetic code, are fascinating intangibles which constantly offer challenges for achieving a better and fuller life. In addition, DNA can create molecules like itself and can transmit basic genetic secrets. It is a keeper of the code for all life and for all time, whether in a microbe, a tree, a fish, or a human being. On the other hand, the administration of medication such as adrenaline to stimulate the heart or to make it start again a surprisingly long time after it has ceased to beat, is an entirely extraneous act, and not in the same biologic category as DNA.

PRACTICAL PHASES OF RESEARCH

Sooner or later, a practical application of the research findings already reviewed is inevitable at all levels. Therefore, instead of spreading our efforts over an area too large for rewarding results in a short paper, we have arbitrarily limited this part of the discussion to mental retardation, one of the most tantalizing afflictions in our society. It is authenticated information that 3 percent of our population need professional care as mental patients, and hundreds of thousands of them need hospitalization. The retarded ought to receive treatment parallel to that for the physically handicapped in terms of appropriate medication, surgery, and therapy. Much of the professional care for the physically handicapped is only temporary. Insulin and certain pain killers are not permanent cures for diabetes and arthritis respectively, yet they are veritable boons to sufferers from these specific ailments. The same deductions can be made concerning surgery and other therapy in many instances.

The mentally retarded come mostly from the high-grade moron class with intelligence quotients of 70 or slightly below, and they are classified as mentally deficient. Some causes of mental retardation are shortage of oxygen during pregnancy, partial strangulation at birth by the umbilical cord, prenatal brain injury, or chemical maladjustments. Very few of these unfortunates are criminally prone. Some can be cured, more of them can be greatly assisted to care for themselves without being a constant burden to their families, and all of them should be afforded every available professional assistance.

Continued neglect by the rest of society will leave most of these ill-favored citizens to their own devices, with tragic results that are best left to the imagination. It is nauseatingly cruel even to think that the mentally retarded should be culled out and destroyed, somewhat in the manner of shooting a horse if he breaks a leg. But the retarded have received worse treatment than that when society, in the not too distant past, incarcerated them in prisons with the criminally insane and the vilest of felons. This gruesome reference is a statement of fact, and should shame all of us. It is well established that a very thin mental thread usually differentiates the normal from the mentally deficient, and the normal from the genius.

There is no room for anyone to boast of superiority. It is unjustifiable, when we fail so palpably to make ourselves available for work in the programs of assistance to the retarded, and fall so short of genuine aid and comfort to the mentally normal but bewildered parents of retarded children. Virtually all the world religions share a common tenet that their members and adherents should pray for guidance from the Creator as they attempt to fulfill their obligations to everybody in sickness and distress. From that standpoint we have arbitrarily named Christianity as illustrative in demanding that its membership care for the sick and helpless. A most definite mandate was given by Christ to John the Baptist in the words: "Tell John what things ye have seen and heard; how that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, to the poor the Gospel is preached." That command covers the "law and the prophets." Some other religions impose similar obligations on their followers.

In the great venture of creation, it would seem that the matters of highest import are the functions of humanity in terms of how it rises to meet its obligations, how it has reacted all along to entailing rewards and punishments, and how it interprets the struggle for survival and improvement of the human race from the beginning to the end. It is illogical for any person to assume innocence of responsibility regarding the welfare of other people, whoever they are or wherever they may live. Every average good person will assist his fellow citizens in distress, without exception, unless physically unable to do so. A persistent question is whether the human race will elect to care adequately for its mental and physical defectives, delinquents, and dependents, or whether such procedures will go by default, and men will continue to rush at each other's throats to prove some imagined supremacy. A solution to this problem will determine who shall inherit the earth—the meek, or the warmongers. As this worldwide picture passes before our eyes, it leaves the impression that there is not a Messiah waiting to save His people, but a "Tiger at the Gates." The overall situation is not altered substantially by the thesis of a new book "We Are Not Alone" by Walter Sullivan, whose enthusiastic reviewers claim that this book is by far the best and most fascinating story of the possible existence of life on other known or undiscovered planets within communicable range of the earth. These highly speculative suggestions have only a minor effect upon the thinking of those in the upper-age brackets, and do not excuse anyone from present obligations to his fellowmen on this planet.

There is no necessity to accept, without reservations, the incomplete findings of research, regardless of tacit endorsements. Indeed, the judgments of a wide cross-section of our populace often are more reliable than those of some so-called experts in a given field. A well-written application of this point (quoted from a John O'London's leading article in Time and Tide, December 1963) states: "If the critics, who are supposed to be experts and occasionally make vague claims of omnipotence cannot agree, what is a poor layman to make of the whole business? Is it not better for him to rely on his own judgment, such as it is, and is it not further proof that after all, the critics only express their own personal opinion which is not basically any more valuable than the next man's?" The quest for truth is not new. Although science has changed our thinking habits, and the content of the physical world also has changed during the last century, is that in itself any reason why an embryologist, for instance, must turn agnostic or atheist, or that religiously motivated entelechies must be fought doggedly by mechanistic explanations of life? The conclusions of philosophers caught the attention of the common people long ago. Thales, in the sixth century B.C. went further than inquiring what happened, and asked why it happened. Anaxagoras (500–429 B.C.), Hippocrates (460–370 B.C.) and Democritus (460–370 P.C.) discussed with their pupils in classes and with the populace in public gatherings, such subjects as atoms, evolution and mental diseases. Roger Bacon (1214–1294) was the reputed father of experimental science, but that honor entails many qualifications. Galileo (1564–1642), who felt the cruel and senseless oppression of religious and other bigots, was the genuine boon to modern science. The grateful appreciation of all scholars is laid at the feet of the remembered, and those of the forgotten pioneers in experimental research. After all, there is no technique by which mortals can document metaphysical data. When nothing more can be done in a situation, such as explaining the miracle of birth or deciphering the dawn of self-consciousness, it should be accepted as is without reserving the privilege to name it.

It is a matter of shame that in the Christian era, supposedly the most enlightened of all periods, there have been so many widespread, long, bitter, fanatical, and totally useless wars among followers of God, brought about by what the populace thought their God wanted them to do. At present there is a stalemate along that front, but only to make room for the ever-waiting opportunity to set the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. As though it were not sufficient to have some kind of death struggle ever with us, we are reminded matter-of-factly by physical scientists that there is a modern Sword of Damocles hanging over our heads in the form of the second law of thermodynamics, which reads, in a standard dictionary: "When free interchange of radiant energy or heat conduction takes place between two bodies at different temperatures, it is always the hotter of the two that loses energy and the colder that gains energy." Thus there have been inestimable geologic eons during which this planet was too hot for human existence; then came the period during which humanity has been table to live on earth; but the time will come when man will be unable to survive here any longer because the earth will have unwound itself to a point where its atmosphere will be too cold for human habitation. This changing cycle of atmosphere has been discussed by theologians at least throughout the Christian era, but with no reference to thermodynamics or homeostasis nor the slightest intimation that anything might occur to disrupt the day of judgment.

Parenthetically, it is definitely incumbent upon both religion and science to make known specifically whether there looms a silent mental death struggle between them. That is, whether science assumes that it is will be only a short while until experimental research outmodes orthodox religion, or whether religion, in the security of its tenets, assumes that nothing can prevail against it. Obviously, there is no open declaration of war. Science on the one hand maintains that it is a technical subject, totally foreign to religion, and religion on the other hand tenaciously clings to such intangibles as are expressed in the famous Browning couplet that "God's in His heaven, all's right with the world." Religious forces can overcome ignorance and paganism by education. Every scholar knows that if the church had not fostered education through the centuries, there would have been little science to date. This is not a time for shadowboxing, nor for emphasis upon the segmentation which divides our society into professional and antiprofessiona casses, and sets one group aganst the other to ludicrous limits. It should be kept in mind that no group has any monopoly on training, and no group dominates loyalty to purpose.

PERSONAL EVALUATIONS

In line with the tenor of this paper, let us now spell out in general terms, who we are as persons, and where I or any other person blends into the world pattern. The impelling force of the data on the miracle of birth as discovered by physical science, and the data on human behavior as discovered by the mental and social sciences are not terminal in themselves. An individual person as a distinctive unit of mankind, according to DNA pattern, is a small piece of protoplasm which developed into an adult; in the natural course of events all along the way, his habits, attitudes, skills, knowledges, interests, and ideals have been scientifically measured and recorded by appropriate authorities.

In a discussion of the individual's importance, it is irrelevant whether or not he is too small, in a telescopic view of the universe, to merit consideration. When it is realized that the speed of light is 186,000 miles per second, the tremendous mileage in a light year, and the number of light years required for some far-off stars to become visible on earth, it is not much wonder that amateur astronomers are lost in the vast distances involved. Until quite recently most people believed that mankind existed in a physical universe composed of three levels: a middle one, part of our solar system, where we lived; a lower one where those who had sinned were consigned; and a high one with the sky as its floor—a place called heaven. Such a conception obtained until it was learned that, outside our own atmosphere, ther is no north, south, east or west, and no higher and lower.

It is also irrelevant to argue that man as a unit is too large for comparative considerations, since the microscope reveals that there are 5 octillion hydrogen atoms in one human body, and that if all the thermonuclear energy contained in one person could be released at once, the explosive force would be 100 times greater than the A-bomb dropped on Hiroshima. It is further irrelevant to maintain that I, as an average human, have either much or little equity in the universe, but it is highly relevant to realize that all I am is my equity in it. For that reason I am more interested in me as a person that I am in any or all other persons combined.

Man has always found it easy to follow his own inclinations, and irksome to conquer his own shortcomings. It seems natural to conclude that life is a riddle, and the more he endeavors to resolve it, the more confused he becomes. The riddle is eternal, and crops up at every crisis. The more we learn about the world, the wider become the domains of the unknown. As a threefold aside: (a) this is not the place to hazard even a guess as to how much blame can be charged against the billions who, through the ages, never had an inkling about the formulation of consistent concepts of right and wrong; (b) it depends entirely upon what kind of God exists and what kind of persons we are; if there is no God, what matters whither we are bound, or whether there is any place to go? and (c) is it justifiable to assume that losing mental functions while maintaining a normal state of bodily health, is a fault in the structure of creation?

In the cotton mills where I was employed more than 60 years ago, I was perforce associated with many who, after the manner of the "orators" in Hyde Park, London, harangued in the factories and in the public squares, that the world was all awry. They often projected the theme that there is no basis in fact for teleological argument to establish the reality of God, and they seemed to gloat over the thought of making the blood run cold in the hearts of believers. It was then, as it is now, the vogue to write letters in the local press for the assumed edification of the populace. These agitators quoted detached statements from such scholars as Sophocles, Lucretius, Voltaire, Darwin, and Spinoza, which they reeled off as "sweet morsels." My own reactions to such antics were not born of antagonism so much as of dread. The real attitude of these noisemakers was a defense mechanism, a term not much used at that time, and it never dawned upon me how easy it is to garner verbal ammunition from random out-of-context quotations. These same noncommitment advocates think they "play it safe" in the active arena of religious endeavor. They presume that if there is no hereafter, they will do just as well for themselves to have made no profession of faith. But if there is a hereafter, they will plead innocence and throw themselves on God's mercy.

At this late date in my life, I am tremendously concerned to learn who I am as a person and what, if any, are my obligations to work out my own salvation. My personality—which is comprised of the traits, modes of adjustment, behavior habits, and relations to others in my environment—warns me against treating my religious obligations flippantly and assuming to dismiss them with a figurative wave of the hand. A fable I first heard 7 decades ago comes to mind. The story concerns three grasshoppers on a cement sidewalk, solemnly debating the origin and status of mankind. One insisted that man was the pride and joy of the Creator, and only a little lower in rank than the angels; the second maintained that man was an insignificant nobody; the third grasshopper had just taken charge of the meeting and was about to affect a compromise in the proceedings, when an errand boy from the local bakery came running down the street; by chance he stepped on all three grasshoppers—and they were no more. It is not unexpected among us seniors that so many of our friends and acquaintances pass by, never to return, but it is rather tragic that the only comment we seem able to make is that the departed are better off. Such a sentiment does handsomely for a closing climax in "A Tale of Two Cities," for instance, but it fails to impress me in reference to my own demise.

There is, admittedly or otherwise, a religious aspect of our lives. All people mentally capable of contemplation on matters eschatological are more or less interested in what becomes of themselves after this life, even though there is no incontestable answer. It is erroneous to classify people as believers or nonbelievers, without any qualifications. Religion is the one great separator of mankind into classes and sects, with numerous variations. Indeed, it is part of man's personality. Each person's problems and the solutions of them are privately his own, and he works them out from time to time. No man's problems can be resolved by others.

I feel privileged to ask God for help in living a fuller and happier life by obeying, among other regulations, a dictum in the Old Testment (Micah 6:8): "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"? It is somewhat of an affront to ask the Almighty to do for us what mortals are unable to do for themselves, such as govern the weather, or keep us always in the best of health. I thank God every night that I have lived another day, and I feel better when I have told Him of my appreciation. I am boundlessly comforted in my religious experiences whenever I hear this particular hymn, for instance, that a very dear friend sang so often during her more than 2 score years of valient service in church worship. The lyrics of the first stanza and chorus are:

"I come to the garden alone,
While the dew is still on the roses,
And the voice I hear, falling on my ear,
The Son of God discloses.

"And He walks with me, and He talks with
me,
And He tells me I am His own;
And the joys we share as we tarry there,
None other has ever known."

A whole battery of objections can be laid against the theology in these lyrics, but all hymnody gives me a spiritual lift, and who is to gainsay it? I elect to go my way because I know the direction; and because I know my way, I propose to go to the end. So, I wait, alone.

The Right of Dissent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, while I have consistently supported President Johnson's actions regarding Vietnam, I have also consistently defended the right of any American to disagree with those actions and policies. In that spirit, I am pleased to insert here a statement by the Committee To Stop Escalation in Vietnam reflecting such a dissent. This committee is located in Westport, Conn., which is in my district. I know many of its members and I respect them personally. But this matter I strongly disagree with their view, as they disagree with mine. However, they do have a right to be heard, and I therefore submit for them the following statement from David G. Lyon:

STATEMENT OF DAVID G. LYON

The ad hoc Committee to Stop Escalation in Vietnam was started in the spring of 1965 after the United States bombed North Vietnam. It originated with a nucleus of people who had been in the leadership of the Independent Committee for the Election of Johnson. This committee consisted of Republicans, Independents, and Democrats in our community who had contributed substantially to the President's campaign and who had worked hard to build his plurality in the area because he repudiated the prowar policies of Barry Goldwater.

This preelection, anti-Goldwater stand reflected the mood of the American people and it was clear to the world that Johnson's return to the White House was a mandate to the administration to seek peace-oriented alternatives in our domestic and foreign policies. Instead, the course of our administration, with respect to the rest of the world, assumed the same orbit as, and an eventual rendezvous in an ideological vacuum with the Goldwater-Nixon complex, which contemplates a world at war for the next 20 years with a better than even chance for a nuclear doomsday.

The concept of settling political differences with war is unthinkable in a nuclear age. Moreover, we will never be able to achieve the "Great Society" or to prove the efficacy of democracy by expending our maximum potential in the pursuit of war.

There are now 200,000 of our young men in Vietnam. Our military are now talking about increasing the Armed Forces in Vietnam to 400,000, How many after that? Are we developing a society which thrives on war at the expense of the minds, bodies, and lives of incalculable numbers of youth for an indeterminate number of years? Does it make sense to visit brute force and massive destruction on other people in other lands in the name of world freedom and peace?

Inasmuch as this war was negotiated 11 years ago in Geneva, our Government is acting illegally by pursuing the war in Vietnam. The United States has never declared war, nor has it submitted the question for congressional study.

In view of the administration's rapidly disintegrating machinery for peace and the dominance of the "hawks" in our Government, the committee continues its work to preserve as much as possible a climate of reason in which people who, for practical as well as humanitarian purposes, want to offer civilized alternatives to the solution of world problems and to encourage the representatives in the Senate and Congress to speak out for a settlement of the Vietnam war through the legally constituted bodies of the United Nations and Geneva Conference.

Our committee now receives the support of hundreds of people in the area of Fairfield County and includes in its membership business and professional people, educators, artists, clergymen, and people who work in the communications industry, advertising and public relations. It also coordinates its activities with many other peace organizations in Connecticut. As Americans concerned about the future of our country and the world, we appeal to our representatives in Government to stop the bombing and proceed toward a political settlement of the war in Vietnam.

Clarksburg, W. Va.—Birthplace of Stonewall Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, my State of West Virginia was born of the strife of the Civil War. It was the scene of numerous Civil War battles which pitted brother against brother and friend against friend. Several of the great Civil War generals were born in the hills and valleys of West Virginia, as it was known prior to secession from Virginia and becoming officially admitted to the Union on June 20, 1863. Among the Civil War leaders who called western Virginia their home was Stonewall Jackson, who was born in Clarksburg, W. Va., on January 21, 1824. It was ironic that Stonewall Jackson was killed in battle in 1863—the year West Virginia became a State. He was 39 years old at the time. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following extremely well-written article which appeared in the January 21, 1966, edition of the Clarksburg, W. Va., Exponent on Stonewall Jackson:

STONEWALL JACKSON WAS BORN IN CLARKSBURG 142 YEARS AGO TODAY

Today marks the 142d anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson, born in Clarksburg, January 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, informed the press that two local organizations are honoring the occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy have placed a wreath on both the Stonewall equestrian statue and on the bronze plaque erected on the site in the 300 block of West Main Street where the famous general was born.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club has remembered the 142d anniversary by placing a wreath on the striking equestrian statue located on the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse.

The Clarksburg chapter of the UDC erected the bronze plaque in August 1911 to commemorate the famous general's birthplace. On May 10, 1953, the equestrian statue was dedicated.

The magnificent work of art was sculptured by the late Charles Keck of New York and the base of the statue was designed by William Grant, Clarksburg architect.

Birshtein furnished the press with the following information regarding Clarksburg's great general and renowned military tactician:

Clarksburg's brilliant officer during the War Between the States acquired the sobriquet or nickname of "Stonewall" with the stubborn defense of his 1st brigade in the first Battle of Manassas (Bull Run) on July 21, 1861.

Gen. Barnard E. Bee in rallying his men exclaimed "See, there stands Jackson like a stone wall." A near rout for the Confederate forces was turned into an overwhelming victory. Throughout the Confederacy and the world he became "Stonewall Jackson" from that moment on.

General Jackson was one of the ablest of the Confederate officers, and was probably the greatest corps commander on either side during the war. He had a deeply religious nature and has often beeh compared with the Cromwellian leaders in England, historians contend.

He deprecated secession but was a strong believer in States' rights, and when Virginia withdrew from the Union he maintained his allegiance to the State.

The military tactics of "Stonewall" Jackson are studied at West Point, Virginia Military Institute, Fort Knox, in St. Cyr, France, and at Sandhurst, England. It is said to be the consensus of military experts that his genius has seldom been equaled and never surpassed.

One of the finest tributes to "Stonewall" was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" in the Hall of Fame at New York University, May 19, 1957:

"Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area of World War II, 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and "Stonewall" Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.' "

Two of "Stonewall's" favorite maxims are "You may be whatever you resolve to be" and "Never take counsel of your fears."

Birshtein said that few persons in West Virginia realize that the Clarksburg Public Library has an original letter by Stonewall. This letter is on exhibit together with a miniature replica of the Polaris submarine, the *Stonewall Jackson*, and other diversified mementos dealing with General Jackson.

Miss Charlotte Bailey, librarian, has extended an invitation to the public to visit the Clarksburg Public Library and examine the Jackson items being displayed.

Also on display is an excellent sketch by Bruce Haymond of Jackson's birthplace (234–328 West Main Street) now occupied by a mercantile store. The sketch graphically reveals a neat 3-room brick cottage with semiattic and inset porch, of a type now fast disappearing.

A large oil painting by David Van Pelt is also on exhibit in the library. This painting of Stonewall is by Edwin F. Draughman and is a fine copy of the famous original by John A. Elder in the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

A ladderback rocker which belonged to Stonewall's mother can also be seen in the library.

The original letter by Jackson was presented to the library by the late D. H. Hill Arnold of Elkins, grand nephew of Stonewall.

The letter, postmarked West Point, is addressed to Jackson's sister, Mrs. L. (Laura) A. Arnold of Beverly, Randolph County.

Stonewall wrote his sister of his preparations for the annual examination at West Point and reported that his health was "very good at the present." He requested that his sister inform him as to the subscription rates of "the Democratic paper published in Clarksburg."

Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan, and Stonewall's sister Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery located in Jackson Park located on East Pike Street in Clarksburg.

The general's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister, Laura, is buried in Buckhannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39, near Guinea Station, Va., and is buried in Lexington, Va. He had led the army corps around Hooker's flank at the battle of Chancellorsville, routing the right wing of the Federal army.

He was wounded and died of pneumonia.

His death was a severe blow to Gen. Robert E. Lee and the southern cause. Jackson was a religious man who always prayed before battle. He was a tactician of the first rank and although a strict disciplinarian, was popular with his men. He was Lee's ablest and most trusted lieutenant.

Speaker McCormack Looks at the 1966 Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, the monthly publication New Englander, a business news magazine published by the New England Council, contains in its January 1966 issue a well-written and informative article by our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. The article is entitled "Congressional Legislative Outlook for 1966."

It provides us with an excellent insight into the current session of Congress as seen by a man who has been a Member of Congress for more than 47 years, served for many years as majority leader and for the past 4 years as Speaker of the House. Although the article was written before the session started, I am sure my colleagues will find it of great interest.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article into the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATIVE OUTLOOK FOR 1966

(By JOHN W. MCCORMACK)

While my assigned topic is to set forth the likely congressional legislative program for the upcoming year with particular reference to its effect on New England, I feel, as the Congress which will meet in January is the same Congress which adjourned in October, a brief backward glance, by way of introduction, at what the 89th Congress did during its 1st session might provide valuable clues as to its likely course of action during its 2d session. The 89th Congress responded in a responsible and humanitarian manner to the complex economic and social problems with which mid-20th century American society is faced. The legislation passed by this Congress has already produced a robust and expanding national economy, and it acted in a statesmanlike manner to carry out our military and moral commitments as the leader of the free world and thus help maintain peace.

It is unnecessary to belabor the point that the maintenance of national prosperity and world peace is of overriding concern to New England as it is to every other region of this country, dwarfing into insignificance any purely regional matters.

In cooperation with the splendid leadership of President Johnson, this Congress has written the most outstanding record of legislative achievement in American history. In its deliberations and actions in the domestic area it has been the coauthor with the President in formulating a whole battery of programs which, by aiding and uplifting our less-fortunate fellow citizens, will make this country truly a more perfect democracy and thus bring us closer to the attainment of those ideals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. I feel certain that in broad general terms the 89th Congress will in its 2d session continue to move in this same progressive, humanitarian direction.

As to specifics, it would be impossible and I feel most inappropriate for me at this time to try to set forth in any detail next year's congressional legislative program. Shortly after the first of the year, I am certain the President will hold a meeting with the Democratic congressional leadership at the White House, outline his legislative objectives for the upcoming congressional session and submit them to the leadership for tactical advice and guidance. Only then would I be in a position to enumerate at any length the bills which the Congress will be likely to act on during 1966.

VITAL INTEREST TO NEW ENGLAND

Nevertheless, we shall be required to take action in a number of areas all of which I feel certain will be of vital interest to New England. First, it is mandatory that the several Great Society programs enacted during 1965 be adequately funded in 1966. Many of these programs were long-term in nature, providing for a relatively small beginning initially but authorizing a greatly accelerated operation in future years. Because of this, in many cases they will require substantially larger appropriations for fiscal year 1967 than were provided in last year's Appropriation Acts.

Included among such programs are those authorizing Federal assistance to combat air and water pollution, highway beautification, urban renewal and planning, grants for community facilities, mass transportation, antipoverty, and Federal aid to education, higher, secondary, and primary. The primary thrust of many of these programs will be in the urban areas. New England, being almost exclusively urban, therefore has an important interest in their successful long-term implementation.

In addition, two of the truly great social reform measure enacted during the 1st session of the 89th Congress—namely, rent supplements and the Teacher Training Corps—were not provided with any funds prior to adjournment. The Teacher Training Corps would provide Federal financial assistance to send specially trained experienced teachers into poor areas, both rural and urban, to enable those areas to uplift the quality of their teaching. Complete control of educational policy would, of course, continue to reside in the local communities. Both private and public schools would be eligible for this aid.

The rent supplement program would afford private enterprise an opportunity to rehouse our poorest citizens in decent housing; it would be in addition to and not replace the existing public housing program. The importance to the New England States of these worthy programs is, I believe, self-evident and it is imperative that both be adequately funded by the Congress early next year.

SEVERAL BILLS PENDING

Despite the unprecedented legislative output during the past session, several vital bills remained pending before the Congress when the first session ended. A proposal to strengthen fair employment practices has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and made in order for consideration by the House under the 21-day rule. It will be programed for early floor action in 1966.

Another measure raising the minimum wage and broadening its coverage has likewise been favorably reported by the House Education and Labor Committee. I have always strongly supported minimum wage legislation, having helped pass the original Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938 and voted for every subsequent improvement in that law. I shall therefore, of course, give my full support to legislation to raise the minimum wage and expand its coverage when the measure is considered by the House early next year.

President Johnson has strongly recommended to the Congress that our unemployment insurance system, which has not been substantially modified since its inception 30 years ago, be updated so as to better implement its objective of strengthening our family life. A bill to carry out the President's recommendations is now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee, and it will be quickly programed for action in the House as soon as it is reported by that committee.

NEW ENGLAND CAN GAIN A GREAT DEAL

I am firmly convinced that the New England economy has a great deal to gain from the passage of all of this legislation as indeed is has benefited from the Great Society laws already passed. The enactment of all three measures will result in increasing the purchasing power of the great mass of American workers who then in turn will be good customers from New England's manufactured products. Legislation such as FEPC, minimum wage, and unemployment insurance are sometimes pictured by their opponents as antibusiness proposals. Nothing could be further from the truth. Quite the contrary, they are truly probusiness measures of the most basic nature because they provide social justice.

It behooves the New England business community as well as all business to give its support to this type of legislation, not only because such legislation is morally right and strengthens the social fabric of this Nation, but because the prosperity and welfare of business in the last analysis always rests upon the availability of customers with adequate purchasing power. It is upon mass effective demand that continued business expansion is dependent, and the only way such mass demand can be sustained over any period of time is to make sure that this country has full employment for all of its citizens without regard to creed or color, at adequate wages and enjoying the type of economic security which a modernized unemployment insurance system would provide.

In conclusion, I would state that our economy is now a truly integrated one. New England as a region, while of course possessing unique assets and problems, can only prosper and flourish as a part of an overall dynamic national economy. The policies and programs being pursued by President Johnson's administration and the 89th Congress are without doubt those best suited to the continued expansion and health of that national economy.

Downtown Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, at the invitation of Mr. Robert C. Baker, the distinguished and genial president of Downtown Progress, I attended last Thursday the annual luncheon of that important organization, a group which contributes so much to our National Capital. A significant portion of the program was devoted to the report of the vice president, Mr. Robert H. Levi, on the activities of Downtown Progress under the leadership of Mr. Baker during the past year. Mr. Levi's interesting and stimulating report contains much information of interest to the entire Nation, and indicates the need for congressional action in many areas to help encourage the growth of our Capital City. Mr. Levi's report follows:

REPORT ON DOWNTOWN PROGRESS

(By Robert H. Levi)

As 1966 gets underway, it is my function to look back at 1965 and then to the future. The year 1965 was a significant year for Washington and for downtown progress. Several key decisions were made which will insure the forward direction of the downtown revitalization program. A number of other major decisions must be made, however, if we are to attain the development goals established in the action plan for downtown. In short, this is a "much has been done, but much remains to be done" report on downtown progress.

Let us review briefly the status of downtown revitalization:

1. The District of Columbia now can use urban renewal to help solve the problems of downtown Washington and to stimulate private development. This authority was granted by a provision of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. The District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, the District of Columbia government, and the National Capital Planning Commission have begun a downtown feasibility survey to develop basic information required for the preparation of an urban renewal plan for downtown. Downtown Progress is serving as a consultant to the public agencies on the feasibility survey.

2. Work has been started on a rail rapid transit system for Washington. In 1965, the Congress authorized a transit development program prepared by the National Capital Transportation Agency, and made an initial appropriation of $6.2 million for design and engineering studies. Construction of a subway below downtown G Street is to begin in 1968.

3. The District of Columbia is acquiring property in downtown for the right-of-way for a section of the center beg freeway, from Constitution Avenue to New York Avenue NW. During 1965 the alinement of the center leg freeway tunnel below the Mall was changed from a curve to a straight line, as proposed originally by the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic, thus improving driving safety and reducing costs. This decision was possible because of agreements involving the National Park Service, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue, to construct a reflecting pool on the Mall above the freeway tunnel. No definite schedule can be established for the construction of this freeway, however, until the Congress passes legislation to permit the District of Columbia to finance its highway program. This legislation is needed badly.

4. Architectural and engineering drawings are being prepared for the F Street demonstration blocks, from 12th to 14th Streets NW. The key to this action was a demonstration grant awarded to the District of Columbia by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in 1965. The District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic will start reconstruction of these two blocks of F Street in the spring of 1966. The purposes of the demonstration are to reduce traffic congestion, to increase pedestrian safety, and to stimulate private business and private development activity. The F Street design by Chloethiel Woodard Smith & Associates is being developed with the participation of property owners and proprietors of businesses in the demonstration blocks. Downtown Progress, at its own expense, is furnishing the project manager to the District of Columbia Department of Highways and Traffic.

5. A design for Lincoln Place is nearing completion. Downtown Progress retained design consultants for this proposal in 1965, to create an appropriate setting on downtown 10th Street for the historic Ford's Theater and the Petersen House where Lincoln died. Ford's Theater is being restored to its original appearance by the National Park Service, and means now are being studied to develop Lincoln Place within as close a time as possible to the completion of the restoration project.

6. An important and historic decision, of course, was the approval by President Johnson of the designation by the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, of the Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site. This will provide the framework for design and development action under legislation now being considered by the Congress to establish and provide funds for a Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Pennsylvania Avenue National Historic Site includes 28½ blocks in downtown. The relationship between that proposal and downtown will be clarified during the downtown feasibility survey.

7. I can report significant progress on public building construction in downtown: the U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals is nearing completion overlooking Lafayette Square; restoration of Ford's Theater is nearing completion, as I noted earlier; property is being acquired at the corner of Ninth and G Streets for a new downtown library. Downtown Progress carried out the studies of space requirements and site possibilities for this library at the request of the District Commissioners.

Property has been acquired and plans are being drawn for the FBI Building on Pennsylvania Avenue, between 9th and 10th Streets. This major structure, to house approximately 7,000 employees, is being designed to conform with the Pennsylvania Avenue plan.

The Old Patent Office at Eighth and F Streets is being remodelled for the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts, to be under the supervision of the Smithsonian Institution. These will be added attractions in downtown for residents and for visitors to Washington.

And the District of Columbia and the General Services Administration have agreed to a location for a new building for the Department of Labor to house 7,000 employees. This structure will be built on air rights above the center leg freeway at Constitution Avenue.

8. The increase in private development activities east of 15th Street since downtown progress began in 1960, has been encouraging. For 10 years prior to that date, only six substantial private, commercial, and residential buildings had been started in downtown east of 15th Street. In the 5 years from 1961 through 1965, however, 27 substantial private buildings were started. This record of 27 starts in these past 5 years compared with 6 starts in the preceding 10 years is impressive.

I should like to make it clear, at this point, that downtown progress isn't claiming all the credit for this change in attitude toward private development. I do believe, however, that the existence of this organization of business and civic leaders interested in and working for a revitalized central city has certainly been a major factor in the change in attitude on the part of private investors.

The things that have been accomplished have involved high levels of cooperation between private organizations and public agencies, and among individuals representing a wide variety of civic, business, and government groups.

The things that remain to be done will require a continuation of this process of private and public cooperation:

1. The parking problem in downtown and in other congested parts of the city must be solved. Every survey that we have done, and we've interviewed and questioned thousands of people—residents, shoppers, employees, and visitors—has shown inadequate parking to be the most serious physical problem in downtown.

We believe that the storage of automobiles is as essential to the public interest as are roads, mass transportation, and traffic controls. In order to assure sufficient parking at proper rates and at the right locations to serve the general public, there must be a responsible, effective public agency. Since the parking job is not being done adequately by private enterprise, public action and assistance is required in order to meet the needs of the community. Such public action has been necessary in nearly all of the major cities across the Nation.

2. Legislation is required to permit the District of Columbia to lease sites to private developers to build on air rights over the center leg freeway and over other freeways. Such action would open up opportunities for the development of air-rights structures such as illustrated by Downtown Progress, for parking, motor hotels, office space, and other activities which would benefit by the accessibility provided by the freeways, and which would be welcome additions to the tax base of the District of Columbia.

3. Legislation also is required to establish the National Visitor and Student Center, for which the Union Station would be an excellent location. We are pleased that President Johnson indicated his interest in 1965 in the development of a visitors' center to provide "perspective and understanding regarding the Federal Government to the myriad students and tourists who come to Washington to see and learn."

4. And in conclusion, we look to the District of Columbia government, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Capital Transportation Agency, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, and other public agencies, to fulfill their responsibilities for sound planning and for early action to make the District of Columbia an even better place in which to live, to work, and to enjoy the benefits of our society.

A good start has been made toward the revitalization of downtown Washington, but much more remains to be done. Toward these objectives we pledge our full cooperation and support: to assist in every way the revitalization of the Nation's Capital in the same manner as other cities throughout this great country are rebuilding themselves to meet the requirements of the present and future generations of citizens.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 48 years ago, the Ukraine declared its independence from the then-new nation of the U.S.S.R. This was done in good faith by the Rada, or central council, of the Ukraine, acting in accordance with the Soviet Government's proclamation of the right of self-determination for the peoples of the old Romanov empire of the tsars. As could be expected, however, the Communists soon proved how much their declarations were to be trusted, as they have many times since, by proclaiming that independence movements were bourgeois and counterrevolutionary. In the autumn of 1919, the Ukraine helpless against the onslaught of Soviet force, unwillingly became a Soviet Socialist Republic. Despite nearly a half century of Communist oppression, the Ukrainian people have maintained their unique and rich heritage, and their desire for freedom.

Indeed, the annals of Ukrainian Russia are older and more significant than those of any of the Soviet Republics, including the largest and most powerful—the R.S.F.S.R. In fact, the very history of Russia begins in the capital city of the Ukraine—Kiev. The city lent its name to an era—Kievan Russia—almost three centuries in duration, from the 900's to the 1100's A.D. The rich legacy which this Ukrainian period left to that part of the world is unmatched. The art, architecture, literature, public and private institutions, its society and culture have all had their impact on the Communist state which now occupies that unfortunate territory. History, 1,000 years hence, will tell which era—Kievan Russia or Communist Russia—is remembered for its greatness and its heritage.

Since the 12th century and the Mongol invasion, however, the Ukraine has been conquered and divided numerous times between its greedy neighbors, including the Soviet Union. Throughout these long centuries of oppression, the Ukrainian people have shown great fortitude, courage, and unity, and when the Rada proclaimed independence on January 22, 1918, these people could see a dream materialize, a dream of freedom and an end to long-endured sufferings. The Communists, however, soon smashed this dream and gave the rest of the world one of the first signs of how they were to behave in the international arena. The short-lived nation of the Ukraine was one of the first victims of Soviet aggression; aggression which has continued to the present day.

The Ukrainian experience cannot be considered in isolation to the events of today. Its connection with the current situation in Vietnam is aptly expressed by Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc.:

> Although Vietnam engrosses our national attention, we cannot ever afford to ignore the broader interrelated facts of Sino-Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, the syndicate of Red totalitarian regimes, their increasing psychopolitical warfare against the free world, and the underlying captive nations in the Red empire, including 17 million North Vietnamese. To divorce Vietnam from these basic facts would be the height of folly. The techniques of intensive revolution, the Russian-bred Hanoi elite, and Red objectives in Vietnam are no different from those witnessed in 46 years of cumulative Red conquest, commencing with the many non-Russian nations now held captive in the U.S.S.R. itself.

Mr. Speaker, we have forgotten neither the people of the Ukraine nor the people of other nations more recently victims of Communist imperialism. On this 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, let us not only think of the past, but also the future. History is not done with the Ukraine, nor its unfortunate sister republics, and someday, the Communist yoke of oppression will be broken and freedom will be established again.

Adopted Chinese Boy Now Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this article from the Phoenix Gazette of January 10, 1966, tells an interesting and poignant story of hardship, love, and devotion to duty. Most of all, the sense of duty to country of this Chinese boy, a naturalized American, is in stark contrast to the shameful behavior of some of our comparatively well-endowed natives of these shores who burn draft cards. The article follows:

FIGHTS FOR UNCLE SAM: ADOPTED CHINESE BOY NOW SOLDIER

Eighteen years ago a baby boy was left to die on the Chinese-Burmese border.

Today, he is a proud member of the U.S. Army.

His story begins with Dorothy Sterling, who grew up in Phoenix and graduated from Good Samaritan Nursing School. In 1939 she obtained a degree in theology from Cincinatti, Ohio, Bible Seminary, and at the close of World War II went as a missionary nurse to the Lisu tribe in Burma, on the border of Communist China.

She lived among natives who were so poor they often ate tree bark and plant roots to survive. They were made poorer by frequent raids by the Chinese.

It was during one of these raids that Miss Sterling found a Chinese baby who had been left to die after his parents were killed. They had just escaped across the border into Burma.

Miss Sterling adopted the baby and named him David Mark after her favorite characters in the Bible. Six years later, under similar circumstances, she found her second baby—a Chinese girl she named Judy.

Raising the children, while she continued her work with the Lisu tribe, she began to prepare in 1956 for a visit home. Realizing that if she was to get the childten into the United States and back into Burma, she'd have to obtain citizenship for them, she wrote First Christian Church in Phoenix which had been providing support for her work.

The minister, Dr. William S. Boice, asked the help of then Senator Barry Goldwater, Republican, of Arizona, and JOHN J. RHODES, Republican, of Arizona, who introduced con gressional bills giving the children cizenship.

In 1957 David Mark and Judy came to the United States.

While they were here, however, the Burmese Government changed hands and its attitude toward U.S. missionaries. Burma refused to grant return visa.

Undaunted, Miss Sterling enrolled in Pacific Christian College at Long Beach, Calif., and won her master's degree in theology, supporting her family by nursing at Long Beach Hospital.

In 1960, she took her children to Thailand, where with the support of First Christian Church, she worked among the natives.

David returned to the States in 1962 to complete his last 2 years of high school at Seattle, Wash., then went back to help his mother operate the clinic.

A recent letter from Miss Sterling, dated Bankok, Thailand, said she was there with David who had gone to enlist in the U.S. Army. She said David felt he wanted to enlist because "I owe this service to my adopted country."

The Puerto Rican Lawyer in the City of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article of great importance by three distinguished officers of the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York. Messrs. Roberto Lebron, Raymond F. Narral, and Barry Ivan Slotnick—in the New York Law Journal of August 2, 1965—outlined their view of the role and responsibility of the Puerto Rican lawyer in New York City. They point out how necessary proper legal representation is for those confronted with problems of unemployment, housing, violations of civil liberties, exploitation in the purchase of merchandise, welfare, and—of course—encounters with criminal law. The authors are to be commended for their deep understanding and for speaking out for legal services for the poor—an issue the Federal antipoverty program is just beginning to face. Their remarks, as follows, incorporate a position paper presented by these gentlemen at the recent conclave of the Inter-American Bar Association and the American Bar Association at San Juan, P.R.:

[From the New York Law Journal, Aug. 2, 1965]

THE PUERTO RICAN LAWYER IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

(By Roberto Lebron, Raymond F. Narral, and Barry Ivan Slotnick)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The article which follows is the text of a paper presented at the recent jointly held meeting of the Inter-American Bar Association and regional meeting of the American Bar Association at San Juan, P.R. The authors of the paper are president, vice president, and acting secretary, respectively, of the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York. The article reflects the views of those who represent the indigent Puerto Ricans in New York City.)

"For a person to hold rights in theory satisfies only the theory. We have to begin asserting those rights—and help the poor assert those rights. Unknown, unasserted rights are no rights at all," Nicolas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General of the United States.[1]

The above remarks uttered by a most distinguished jurist encompass the awakening of the lawyer to the needs of the poor. No longer can the legal profession stand idly by while inequities and injustices surround its judicial island. No longer can the lawyer escape involvement.

The needs of the poor Puerto Rican have become vivid to the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York by the advent of our all-out efforts to service our community in that great metropolis of New York City.

The Puerto Rican community in New York City consists of approximately 750,000 inhabitants. It has at times been classified as the largest migration of any single group in the Western Hemisphere. Indisputably, the reason for such a large scale migration is the search for a better life, better educational opportunities for the young, better job opportunities, better housing, and an overall desire to lift themselves from the clutches of poverty.

Seeking the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, the Puerto Rican has gambled away his customs, norms, and mores. He has accepted the challenge of living in a new environment which is regulated by different standards of behavior, many foreign to his own. He has thrust himself from a rural environment to a highly complex urban society which has, as an added barrier, a different language of communication.

The migrant Puerto Rican has inherited from earlier migrants to the urban metropolis of the United States the slum dwellings, the unskilled jobs, the high rate of unemployment, the prejudices and other maladies inherent in the lives of the poverty stricken.

The grassroots areas of the law which have its greatest impact on the Puerto Rican in New York are no longer found in the "ordinary courtroom—but in the anteroom of a city, State, or Federal agency as he awaits a determination of vital signifiance to him and his family."[2]

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Puerto Rican in New York City has inherited the unskilled jobs, making them vulnerable to seasonal slacks, automation, and the whim of employers. Statistics show that those most vulnerable to long periods of unemployment are the poor, the migrant, the Puerto Rican. Can lawyers provide assistance to alleviate the serious consequences of unemployment on the Puerto Rican family? Can we decrease the number of broken homes, abandoned and neglected children whose parents turn their backs on responsibility when unemployment runs rampant throughout a poverty stricken community?

Unemployment is certainly not restricted to the Puerto Rican community in New York City. In 1929, when the United States was gripped by a "great depression," social legislation was adopted to combat the identical problems which exist today. New York State has adopted similar legislation and provides for the alleviation of the harsh consequences of unemployment through its unemployment insurance laws. The purposes of the law are spelled out in the Unemployment Insurance Law of the State of New York.[3] However, "unknown, unasserted rights are no rights at all."[4] The Unemployment Insurance Law of New York is complex and its interpretation based on reported case precedents.

The unsophisticated Puerto Rican who seeks benefits cannot possibly prepare or cope with the mandates of statutes and regulations which he does not understand, written in a language foreign to his own and administered by people who have lost the true meaning for its existence. Due to the latter reasons, an unemployed member of our community, with a wife and 11 children is thrust upon the relief rolls when he fails to request a hearing before an impartial referee within the 30-day limitation required by statute, after a discharge from his employment, undisputably through no fault of his own. This lack of comprehension by our community leads to suspensions of greatly needed benefits because of willful misrepresentation, voluntary "quits" and poor or unrealistic job efforts.

An explanatory pamphlet, how to seek benefits, written in Spanish and inadequately distributed, is not sufficient to meet the mandate of the law. Diligent and forceful advocacy is required by our association to bolster the members of our community into seeking that which they are entitled to by right, not by charity, and to apprize administrators of the full intent of the law.

The complexity of seeking unemployment insurance benefits has become burdensome to the members of our community. Unable to articulate the justifiable reasons for these benefit applications, they have come to look upon the agency, specifically set up to assist, as an opponent, ready to take advantage of their lack of knowledge and understanding. The latter opinion is formed when the applicant enters the agencies' offices on any given day and finds large numbers of his countrymen on line. He is fearful of not being able to make himself understood because he lacks the assistance of interpreters or Spanish-speaking employees. Are we, the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York, to abandon our responsibility—we think not.

Representation by lawyers before the agency administering unemployment insurance benefits can no longer be considered a privilege, but a necessity. Puerto Ricans are those greatest in need of this representation inasmuch as they are those who most need these benefits and are less able to articulate their needs.

We cannot allow a young Puerto Rican mother who diligently searches for work as a salesgirl to be suspended from receiving benefits because her "job efforts are unrealistic," "her job searches must be restricted to factory work in which she has some experience."[5] Nor can we allow suspensions for willful misrepresentation because the claimant, unable to make herself the claimant, unable to make herself understood, allowed a fellow claimant to insert in her work booklet "N's" instead of "Y's," nor for a summary of interviews taken by agency employees who speak no Spanish from claimants who speak no English and, subsequently, use these interviews to prejudice the position of the claimant.

If we are really to combat poverty let us start correcting the wrongs which exist in the programs adopted at a much earlier stage of this war.

HOUSING

"A lawyer * * * can serve to fill an enormous need which exists among slum dwellers to have legal assistance to aid them in their perennial battle with the landloard."[6]

The Pureto Ricans in New York City have inherited the slum dwellings of the Lower East Side and the Bronx, and have even managed to have part of the island of Manhattan, a slum, coined as "El Barrio." The slums were certainly there before the advent of the Puerto Rican; he has only served to crystalize the stereotype of the slum dweller.

The Puerto Rican slum existence is vividly portrayed only because his mode of living is not ordinarily an urban enclosure but the outdoors. His walks around "la plaza" have become jaunts to the corner of a block or the brownstone stoops. The Puerto Rican is not the invisible "Other American" portrayed by Michael Harrington in his fine work by the same name. The Puerto Rican is boisterous, alive and much too full of life to be "the silent poor." It is because of this that at times he is erroneously portrayed as "happy" in his "Barrio."

Is it not for us, the Puerto Rican Bar Association of New York, many of us the product of this slum, to ask ourselves whether or not we will allow our community to conform to this existence. Our association will no longer stand by and allow a slumlord to collect rents from our community while at the same time he allows his property to deteriorate to its lowest ebb. Can we stand idly by while rats bite our babies, death strikes because of lack of heat and plaster walls fall unmercifully on our families? We will not.

We will make it possible as lawyers for the Puerto Rican tenant to exercise his rights by leading him through the maze of procedural technicalities and advocating his rights in the courts and administrative agencies. In the area of landlord and tenant law, it is for us, the lawyers, to establish social change by novel legal premises. Novel questions of law must be advanced in this area of law so long ignored. Is it not feasible for a lawyer to advance the established principle of contracts that a breach occurs when the article contracted for is not delivered and, consequently, a breach occurs when heat and hot water are not supplied. It is not a constructive eviction when a tenant's family is relegated to sleeping in one room of a four-room apartment because in the other bedroom the ceiling is in danger of falling.

The lawyer will insure that a tenant will have at his disposal all the rights, privileges and remedies available to the tenant.

In New York City great publicity was recently provided to the "rent strikes" in two areas of New York—Harlem and the Lower East Side. Responsible community leadership spoke in anger because "rent strikes" suggested that the tenants absolutely refused to pay rent. (In reality the practice was to have the tenants pay their rent into court.)

That slum tenants would refuse to pay rent to slum landlords was in some circles considered evil. However, slum tenants found no other way to bring justice to bear. Their failure to pay rent would bring on a summary proceeding for nonpayment of rent. Once the slumlords instituted a proceeding to evict for nonpayment the tenants would interpose the defense of violations of record; ask for a stay pursuant to section 755 of the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, permitting the tenant to pay his rent to the court until the landlord corrected the violations.

The small inroads made by our brethren who provided representation during the "rent strikes" and raised a defense based on section 755 of the real property actions and proceedings law may not have eradicated the slums. But it was because of dili-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

gent and forceful advocacy that such a defense was first interposed on a large scale.

"Legal scholarship is beginning to enter this new field—to analyze the rights of welfare recipients, of installment purchasers, of people afflicted by slum housing, crime, and despair. These are signs too, that a new breed of lawyers is emerging, dedicated to using the law as an instrument of orderly and constructive social change. The Puerto Rican community of New York will not lack proper representation.

CIVIL RIGHTS

It is unnecessary to note in this paper the great strides being made in the area of civil rights. However, for many years the Puerto Rican community has failed to have its leadership articulate its need in this area. It was not until recently that the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights was formed. Our association is a leader in this field. Violations of civil liberties must be guarded with all the strength at our disposal; they are basic to a civilized society. Our president has recently been engaged in many high-level discussions with the New York City Police Department and the mayor of New York City so that we can assure proper administration of all city agencies which, if ignored, can dangerously approach civil liberties violations.

CONSUMER PROBLEMS

The office of Louis J. Lefkowitz, the attorney general of the State of New York, recenly released a report indicating a record number of complaints of fraudulent practices by the gyp merchant. "Swindlers prey on people with language difficulties or in the lower economic brackets."[9] No doubt a high number of those swindled were the non-English-speaking Puerto Ricans. The number of Puerto Ricans who discover that they have an obligation to pay a finance company for low quality furniture or for a TV set which was never delivered is innumerable. The lack of sophistication enhanced by the lack of knowledge of the language spoken by the swindling merchant makes the Puerto Rican easy prey to disastrous income obligations. It is interesting to note that the highest percentage of fraudulent merchandizing is found in the poverty stricken communities.

The great need for legal assistance to the Puerto Rican community was pointed out by Dr. David Caplowitz, of Columbia University, in his recent study entitled "The Poor Pay More." Caplowitz states: "I became personally aware of these problems when, in 1960, I was asked by several settlement houses in New York City to do a survey of the consumer problems of low-income families. We interviewed almost 500 families living in low-income housing projects in the city. The median income of the families in our sample was about $3,300. Some 15 percent were receiving welfare assistance. Most of the families were members of racial or ethnic minorities. Forty-five percent were Puerto Ricans, 30 percent Negro, and 25 percent white, exclusive of Puerto Ricans."

Mr. Caplowitz found that the majority of those interviewed were paying exorbitant prices for shoddy merchandise; that the majority were involved in critical installment obligations and were unable to overcome the potpourri of legal entanglements because of their installment purchases, which often led to catastrophic financial obligations.

Mr. Caplowitz further states: "If the poor did not have consumer problems requiring legal services several generations ago, this is no longer true today. Unfortunately, substantial numbers of today's poor have met with exploitation in the marketplace, have become almost hopelessly entangled in instalment debt and have been faced with the legal penalties stemming from missed payments."

Our association has undertaken a speakers bureau, which will make available to all our "Puerto Rican hometown groups" in New York a member of our association, expert in the field in which they desire to be oriented. It is our hope that a concentration in the area of consumer matters will help educate our community to the ways of the gyp merchant.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

The Puerto Rican community in New York City is plagued by the midnight raid, the inhuman investigator and in many cases the almost complete loss of all civil liberties, including his right to privacy and his right as an American citizen to travel to any part of the 50 States.

Serious constitutional questions have been raised over what Time magazine described as:

"The early morning visit, in which investigators charge into a woman's flat at 5 a.m. like gangbusters, and if a man is present, try to find out whether he is filching welfare money or dodging child support. Not surprisingly, some welfare workers object to the technique. Is not the welfare recipient mother entitled to the same constitutional safeguards as is the common criminal?"

Suspensions of welfare benefits for "failure to properly manage funds," or because "it is socially more valid for your family to return to Puerto Rico," or "your intent in coming to New York City was to get on the welfare rolls," are all reasons which must be challenged, especially by the Puerto Rican, who is subjected to the greatest number of decisions of this type.

Welfare recipients must be overly assured that the rights guaranteed all our citizens will not be diminished because of the need of welfare assistance. Our association cannot allow poverty to breed helplessness, fear of retaliation or a concession to defeat. Few, if any, Puerto Ricans, indeed, have any concept of their inalienable rights and their rights to appeal.

Lawyers must be prepared to appeal decisions of suspension of benefits because "it is socially more valid for the client to return with his family to Puerto Rico," or a suspension of benefits to a woman and four children because she allegedly "came to New York without a proper support plan." Is this sufficient reason to allow the woman and four children to starve or house themselves in public hallways? We think not.

It is important to note that case precedent exists which makes it mandatory for a city agency to provide emergency assistance until a hearing is held and a determination rendered: The Puerto Rican community has failed to take advantage of these decisions simply because welfare recipients rarely, if ever, have the legal assistance necessary to pursue their claims. It is our community which suffers the most blatant injustices in this area of poor man's law.

CRIMINAL LAW

New York has been one of the leading States in supplying legal aid to the indigent. This counseling to the impoverished was supplied long before *Gideon* v. *Wainwright* decreed it to be mandatory.

Per capita, the Puerto Rican community of New York City finds itself before the criminal bar of justice with greater frequency than other minorities. The platitude that "poverty breeds crime" is enacted every day in our criminal courts.

The trumpet of Gideon[10] is being sounded through the use of the Legal Aid Society and assigned attorneys. However, the music it plays is sometimes flat and its overtures occasionally falter instead of reaching the crescendo of full protection of human rights and adequate representation.

The highest court of the land has decreed that all indigent defendants have the right of counsel in criminal cases.[11]

However, the plight of the Puerto Rican defendant differentiates itself from the problems facing other accused.

More often then not the defendant does not understand either the language or the court proceedings.

(The problems inherent from arrest to arraignment are manifold and will not be discussed in this paper.)

Upon arraignment, the Puerto Rican defendant is usually unable to post bail. Consequently, he is returned to the county jail. Even if VERA[12] were applicable, his comparatively short period of residence and uninterrupted length of employment would not place him among those eligible for consideration. If the defendant makes bail he finds he is no longer eligible to be represented by court assigned counsel.

From the time of his arraignment until trial may take a period from 30 to 90 days. During this time the accused is incarcerated (nonbail case) and perhaps sees his court-appointed attorney on one occasion. The legal aid attorney is usually not bilingual and vainly attempts to prepare a history of the defendant.

The final notes of Gideon's trumpet usually end with: "Your Honor, the defendant wishes to plead guilty to the charges of * * * to cover the information." The last few bars of our concerto have been written by the district attorney in conference with the appointed attorney, who then attempts to explain the arrangement to the defendant (through a court interpreter). Finally, he will persuade the accused to accept the plea. Judge Rossbach[13] has categorized this system as "Go, go, go justice." Regrettably, the elements of mass production are applied to a situation that merits more esthetic standards.

However, all is not as bleak as presented above. There are times when court-appointed attorneys are able to more than adequately represent defendants. The latter is unfortunately the exception rather than the rule.

The problems faced are not those of inadequate attempts or lack of interest. On the contrary, adequacy of the legal aid attorney is unquestionable. The interest taken by the public defender is manifested each and every day in his anxiety to aid the wards of our society. The problems are presented by an overcrowded caseload and an understaffed court. In New York County the average daily arraignment calendar lists over 60 cases. The legal aid lawyer must handle over 100 files a week. Therefore, to facilitate matters, the "plea" system of justice has been contrived.

Ab initio, the problem must be met by a total reorganization of the Legal Aid Society, together with an enlargement of their staff and budget. It is further necessary that our criminal court philosophy of justice be reexamined to avoid the assembly line method of justice. Of course, the perennial cry for an increase in the number of judges will be left to the State legislature—(once more).

The average Puerto Rican defendant who retains private counsel is in a somewhat similar position due to the fact that he is not financially able to adequately compensate his private attorney. Therefore, the "plea" system of justice is involved once more; this enables the private attorney to set the case for a lesser remuneration. Arraignment, a plea of guilty and sentencing reduce the number of court appearances, research, and investigation. Preparation for trial is expensive and generally beyond the means of the average Puerto Rican defendant.

Ignorance of the law and its workings tend to perpetuate the continuation of this unfortunate system of jurisprudence in the Puerto Rican community. However, we must once more mention that the aforementioned is simply the rule and there are occasional exceptions.

Footnotes at end of speech.

The indigent Puerto Rican must be assisted in exercising his rights, because rights cannot fully exist unless they are fully exercised. We fall short in the full protection of those rights.

Right to counsel means more than mere representation by an attorney—it has within its meaning a full and adequate counseling with the full use of all means and remedies available. It stands for the proposition that a defendant has a right to an attorney of his own choosing who will use every weapon of the law in the defense of the indigent. It means that the accused shall receive the time, attention and consideration that is necessary—not to be met by an already overburdened legal aid attorney who finds himself compelled to arrive at a speedy and often not unrealistic disposition.

Generally, the cause of the Puerto Rican defendants' appearances before the criminal bar begins with poverty and ends with a total incomprehension of the proceedings. His difficulty with language, custom and financial inability makes him vulnerable to criminal convictions, the consequences of which he must add to the already overburdening number of maladies.

In the teeming metropolis of New York, where we are proud of our heritage of freedom, democracy and equal justice for all, we find that the latter phrase sometimes does not manifest itself in a full protection of the individual rights of all.

"We must be * * * concerned with the broad difficulties of the 20 percent of our population which is * * * serving a life sentence of poverty. It is justice rather than charity which calls on us to see to it that the law and the lawyer are involved in the effort to reverse that life sentence." [13]

Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, relating to the problems outlined above, has stated: "To be sure, these are not new problems. It is our appreciation of them that is new. There has been long and devoted service to the legal problems of the poor by legal aid societies and public defenders in many cities. But, without disrespect to this important work, we cannot translate our new concern into successful action simply by providing more of the same. There must be new techniques, new services and new forms of interprofessional cooperation to match our new interest."

President Johnson has committed his administration to eradicating these specific ills and has established as a tool the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964. We implore the use of this tool.

---

[1] Address given at conference sponsored by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Nov. 12, 13, and 14, 1964, Washington, D.C.

[2] The New Public Law: The Relation of Indigents to State Administration. Edward V. Sparer, director, Legal Services Unit, Mobilization for Youth.

[3] McKinney's Consolidated Laws of New York, vol. 30 (Labor), sec. 506.

[4] Note 1, supra.

[5] Extract from a recent New York State Unemployment Service determination.

[6] Landlord-Tenant Problems, Nancy E. LeBlanc, deputy director, Legal Service Unit, Mobilization for Youth.

[7] Note 1, supra.

[8] New York Times, 100,000 Consumers Complain of Fraud, a Record for State, Feb. 24, 1964.

[9] Time magazine, July 31, 1964.

[10] *Gideon* v. *Wainright*, 372 U.S. 335, 344.

[11] Ibid.

[12] VERA's Manhattan bail project.

[13] Note 1, supra.

North American Aviation Article Discusses Transportation Systems for Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the need for efficient transportation in our cities is one of the most pressing problems facing the Nation. Today outmoded and antiquated systems are expected to move thousands and millions of people about large metropolitan areas, but they just cannot do the job. What we need are new modes of urban transport which can move people about cities quickly, efficiently, and safely without the delays of waiting at the bus stop or transferring to other vehicles.

In order to spur this development, I have introduced H.R. 9200, which amends the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for a program of urban transport R. & D.

Twenty-one other Members of the House have introduced identical legislation. In the Senate, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] introduced an identical bill, S. 2599, which was cosponsored by 10 other Senators.

The sponsors of the legislation in the House, in addition to myself, include: the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley], H.R. 9201; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Cabell], H.R. 9202; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein], H.R. 9763; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser], H.R. 9995; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Gilligan], H.R. 9826; the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths], H.R. 9996; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern], H.R. 9997; the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Irwin], H.R. 10857; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], H.R. 9998; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long], H.R. 9999; the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCarthy], H.R. 10000; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish], H.R. 10001; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moorhead], H.R. 10002; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer], H.R. 9203; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Ronan], H.R. 10003; the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal], H.R. 9204; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Stalbaum], H.R. 10279; the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan], H.R. 9205; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik], H.R. 9206; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Weltner], H.R. 9207; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], H.R. 9208.

The sponsors of S. 2599, in addition to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], include: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Saltonstall].

North American Aviation, Inc., has been one of the leaders seeking solutions to the urban transportation problem. In an article in the current issue of Skyline, published by NAA, Jack J. Jones, assistant to the president for transportation, discusses the techniques used by his company to plan transportation systems for the future and some of the new modes which are in the offing—modes which could be developed under the program proposed in H.R. 9200:

Transportation Tomorrow

(By Jack J. Jones, assistant to the president, Transportation, Los Angeles Division)

On March 17, 1965, North American Aviation was issued a challenge by Edmund G. Brown, Governor of the State of California. The challenge came in the form of a 6-month study contract to investigate the problems of transportation in the State in the coming half-century.

The company was asked to consider everything that moves in the State of California for the next 50 years, whether by land, sea, or air. Communications was included because of the major role it plays in travel.

We were to look underground, under the ocean, as well as in the air. We had to consider the city problem and the recreation problem, the regional problem, the agricultural problem, the industrial problem, the entire problem of movement in California for 50 years. Now this is the sort of challenge that the aerospace industry likes. It's a complete systems problem. In order to get our feet on the ground we had first to conduct a survey on the technological improvements that can reasonably be expected in the next 50 years. We had to do this to "size" the problem and the computer models that we are recommending.

The task of analyzing and planning California's future transportation requirements is very complex. Just as transportation needs are influenced by many things, so does transportation influence many things. Transportation goes where the people and industry go, but the freeway system has shown the opposite is also true: the direction of growth can be guided by transportation. But, people and industry require water, power, waste disposal, education, communications, and other public systems and services as well. These also must be provided.

A LONG LOOK AHEAD

How much industry and how many people will there be in 1990? In 2015? Where might they be distributed; how will the land be used? How much, for what purposes, and between which points will people travel? How many goods will be produced and consumed in California, and from where and to where will they be transported? How much and what will be imported and exported by or through the State? How much land will recreation require, and how much should be devoted to transportation? What will be the likely characteristics, performance, costs, revenues and taxes of each of the possible future land, sea, and air transportation systems and networks? How will these systems interface, and what will be the coordination and integration requirements? How will better communications influence transportation demand? What are the long-range budgeting and legislative implications?

These are significant questions requiring timely answers. Each case should be analyzed under several sets of assumptions and the sensitivity to these assumptions measured. Each case will necessarily draw upon quantities of data if it is to reflect all the essential factors.

SYSTEMS APPROACH

At present, there is no operating device that can encompass this task in a single frame of reference or can master its complexity and handle the data and computations required. But such a device can be made available and can be practically applied.

The systems analysis approach was developed to master the predictable, complex problems of the Nation's areospace and defense activities. In its study, North American applied it to the total transportation problem. The systems analysis study includes building that planning device needed to provide the quantitative measurements that will support human judgments and decisions. This device would be constructed by specialists in many fields and would incorporate advanced analytical techniques. It would be flexible, could accept a range of assumptions, and would display options.

The capacity and capabilities of modern computer and display equipment form a major element of this planning device. Many bits of data, together with the appropriate mathematical formulas and relationships, are inserted into the computer. After presentation of the problem to be analyzed with the assumptions to be used, the computer would perform the mechanics of the many computations required. Results would be printed out in words, numbers and graphs, supplemented by visual displays which could be copied and retained.

The other major element of this planning device would be the humans who compile the formulas, relationships, and programs, who pose the problems and assumptions, and who must apply judgment to the results, make decisions, and implement actions. The computer network simply makes the analysis practical. By handling large amounts of data and performing computations quickly, it provides the decisionmaker a wider and more penetrating frame of reference upon which to base his decisions.

The troubles of transportation today are symptoms of major problems tomorrow, if left untended. Shortcomings in the total transportation system of the State should not be tolerated, and obsolescence cannot be afforded, for transportation moves people and goods and in so doing moves the economy.

In California today the single major transportation headache is that of urban congestion, mostly within but also out of and into the large metropolitan areas.

AVOIDING TOMORROW'S TROUBLES

Two primary factors have led to urban congestion: first, the increased number of trips within the metropolitan area, caused by many factors; and second, a lack of choice in urban transportation in that only one, the automobile, offers flexibility, convenience, and seemingly some measure of economy of time and money to the individual.

Without sufficient insight, planning, and action, the troubles of today could grow to be more costly, perplexing and far reaching tomorrow. If the undesirable impact of these problems is to be reduced or eliminated, the initial effort must be understaken now. The planning and provision of timely transportation systems and networks will be a vital element, greatly influencing our way of life, our economy, and our total environment.

North American's study has pointed us in the direction of a number of new approaches to transportation. Most of them sound like something out of science fiction, but they are feasible now, and many of the techniques and methods of transportation dealt with in the report will be in use decades ahead of the study's 50-year terminal point.

One of the most interesting concepts covered in the study was the tube train. Traveling in the 300- to 600-mile-per-hour range, the tube train would compare with today's commercial jet aircraft for speed, while having the capability of transporting far greater numbers of passengers between major urban centers.

There are currently half a dozen serious types of tube trains. Depending on the terrain, they can travel above, on, or below the ground. The tube itself serves a relatively simple function; it protects the train from such hazards as cattle on the track to rocks in the hands of small children.

THE GRAVITY TRAIN

One of the most unique of the tube-train proposals is the gravity train. It uses the pendulum principle. Beginning at each station, a tunnel is laid out following a pendular path. In this case the tube is evacuated, developing a vacuum ahead of the train so it sucks it in like a piece of wet spaghetti and starts it down the track, using gravity to provide acceleration.

It drops about a mile below the surface in about 8 miles of travel and it is doing 500 miles per hour at that point. It then levels off a mile below the surface and reverses the process as it comes up the other side. Why the expensive tunneling? In this case, the propulsion is practically free once the tunnel is dug. Is it worthwhile to dig a tunnel to get free propulsion for the next 50, 100, or 150 years? If people will ride in it, the answer is probably yes. The question of whether people will travel in such a thing as this has become one of the key elements of our study: the human acceptance of any personal travel device.

GROUND EFFECT TRUCKS

Another interesting device probed by the study is the ground effect machine. A possible future use is the ground effect machine truck. This would travel a so-called ground effect machine track on a guideway. This has advantages in that the guideway has a lip on each side which solves the lateral stability problem. It would be a 150- to 300-mile-per-hour truck from 200 to 300 feet long. Where it loads and unloads it would probably have to move in small areas so it would have to be articulated in order to get around corners. It would probably travel on low-speed wheels when it left its track to move over surface streets. There are a number of ground effect machines presently being proposed.

One of the most familiar is a Department of Defense special skimmer project. The device, similar to the hovercraft in San Francisco Bay, is under consideration as a machine for use in Vietnam and for landing on beaches. Now, they presently all have disadvantages. But as we see them, they're the type of disadvantages that will be tested and engineered out and a successful device will result.

When we talk about shipping, and ocean shipping, we run into a very interesting situation. The U.S. merchant marine has problems. This has been recognized for some time. The Maritime Commission hopes to find a solution to get it off its knees. They are pressing hard to find a new type of ship and this spring they issued a report of some interest. They are looking for a breakthrough in shipping. One such possibility is a device called a surface effect ship. It is similar to ground effect machine, but instead of riding on a bubble of air, it actually flys over the water. This is a 200- to 300-mile-per-hour ship probably 500 feet long. It would go from here to Hawaii in about 10 hours. It is automated so that a crew of about five would run this entire ship. It is a cargo ship that would be run somewhat like an airliner. A check of weather reports would indicate the best route to avoid large waves which would slow the craft.

Turnaround time for a high-speed vessel would have to be much better than anything we now have. The current scheme for overcoming the turnaround problem is the rotation technique.

SHORT TURNAROUND TIME

The ship is brought up to a floating pier, which eliminates the difficulties caused by tidal changes, and the cargo inside the ship is rotated out on a conveyor belt device at the same time as the return-trip cargo is rotated in. Using this procedure, the entire ship could be turned around in less than 45 minutes. Additional fueling of the ship could be accomplished during this brief "down time." This much is certain. There will be a breakthrough in maritime shipping in the next 50 years. With a major effort, the breakthrough could come in less than half that time.

Our airspace represents a different type of problem. With the exception of supersonic commercial transport, which is still several years away, we already have reached a high level of efficiency in moving people and goods rapidly from one point to another.

What we are looking for now is a way to move people relatively short distances, up to 600 miles, at modest speeds, and, most important, with the capability to take off and land on very short runways.

An application of this type of aircraft particularly suited to California is to the State's recreational areas. In many of the hard-to-reach areas, it is nearly impossible to create access without destroying some of the natural beauty which makes them attractive. This type of aircraft could go a long way in solving that. Landing strips could be located in the periphery of our cities. Concrete runways would not be needed, merely a 1,200-foot strip of open land. It is our belief that once people get into the recreation areas they are not interested in going 80 or 100 miles per hour down a concrete strip; that they would just as soon go 10 to 30 miles an hour for the last 5 or 10 miles of the trip as they go through the redwoods or other natural beauty that has drawn them to make the trip.

EXPERIMENTAL DEVICES TODAY

Finally, we must consider private transportation. There are a number of devices and it is difficult for us today to select one and say it is the best of the ones that will take place. But as an example, we chose a vehicle now in display at the new transportation fair in Munich, Germany. It may not be just a ground effect machine, to skim a few inches off the ground, but may be capable of attaining 4,000 to 5,000 feet of altitude. Whether it's this device, or something else, we feel certain in the next 50 years there will be individual air cars, and they won't be of the helicopter type.

Certainly one of the west coast's greatest assets in the consideration of transportation is the Pacific Ocean. California, for example, possesses an enormous coastline, and with it, a unique potential for moving a wide range of supplies by floating pipeline. Such a system is feasible because fresh water weighs less than salt water. If the pipe is selected properly, a pipeful of fresh water will have neutral buoyancy.

USE OF THE SEA

This means it is possible to move large quantities of fresh water from northern California, Oregon, Canada, or Alaska down the coast at sea level without requiring expensive tunneling and pumping. Just enough pumping is required to overcome the frictional loss. Such a system could supply what may be needed next beyond the Feather River requirements of southern California or maybe even central California 50 years from now. Likewise, these pipelines can be used to turn around and move our finished petroleum products or vegetables back to the north. Our studies show that pipelines are an extremely economical, fast method of transportation. It is conceivable that the movement of a large number of commodities that we haven't even dreamed of today, such as lettuce and carrots, will be made by pipeline in this 50-year period.

All of these ideas and proposals, for tube trains, STOL airplanes, high-speed ocean vessels, and ground effect machines, have merit and a place in the future. What is needed most at present is an integrated plan to take what we now have, what we want to have at a later date, and combine them in a meaningful and useful manner.

MANY CONSIDERATIONS

This means systems analysis, encompassing the full range of transportation modes in a single frame of reference. To do this study properly we must include the considerations of population, land use, the economy of the State, and current and future technology. It is a large order, but one which can be reduced to size through systems analysis.

Three factors must be taken into consideration in any estimate of how much movement of people and goods will be required. These are population, personal income, and manufacturing productivity. Within 25 years, for example, the daily number of passenger miles in California will double; in 50 years it will increase five times. The figures for commodities are even more startling. Twenty-five years from now, the indication is that there will be about three times the current number of commodity miles. By 2015 we can expect 7 to 10 times the current volume of goods to be in motion every day.

This brings us back to systems analysis, an approach which the aerospace industry has evolved in order to be able to examine predictable, complex problems. The method uses computer technology to handle an amazingly large amount of data and run it through mathematical formulas in an amazingly short time. The computer is simply a tool. It does not make judgments, but it does enable men to make better ones through its use.

When considering California as a system, it is important to note that the State is only one of a number of similar systems interconnected to form a large network extending through the United States to encompass the entire world. It is readily apparent that what occurs in California depends to some degree on what is going on throughout the entire world. Therefore, any study of the California system and its future transportation requirements must investigate activities which might take place beyond the State's borders. This is emphasized by the fact that California serves as a gateway to the Pacific and experiences a high import/export rate across the State.

Three prime factors are involved in considering California as a system. They are population, land use, and the State's economy. From a computerized balance of these factors, a State profile can be drawn.

Because this is not like a weapon system, it is not possible to satisfy a specification and know that the customer will buy. It is necessary to come up with something that people are going to want to use. This is why human judgment remains a key factor.

COMPUTERS TO GIVE ANSWERS

What the North American systems analysis approach requires is that the State of California describe itself and its transportation possibilities to a computer so that problems can then be presented to it.

When the computer responds with possible answers, it is up to the man who requested them to say what is acceptable and what is not. In the final step, the most attractive options can be passed along to the State's top officials for their decisions.

A vast array of complicated transportation problems await further study today in California. Systems analysis offers an opportunity to plan today to assure the development of a smooth transportation complex in the next 50 years.

The 200th Anniversary of the German Friendly Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in Charleston we like things that endure. We are very proud, both for its endurance and its achievements, of the German Friendly Society, which celebrated its 200th anniversary on January 19. Think of it—a society that is older than the Republic itself. And that has endured despite periods of national enmity and war.

The 200th anniversary celebration of the society, held at the Francis Marion Hotel, was a truly outstanding event. The society was privileged to have as its guest speaker General Hans Speidel, of the Federal Republic of Germany, and I am proud that I had some small part to play in bringing General Speidel to Charleston for the event. On hand to introduce General Speidel was another very distinguished military man, Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, now our Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

General Speidel, who was imprisoned during World War II on the personal orders of Himmler, left the quiet chair of a history professor in 1951 to help the Federal Republic of Germany build its defense forces. He was the first commander of the Federal Republic's armed forces and later spent 7 years as commander in chief of allied land forces, central region—which put him in command of the bulk of NATO-assigned ground forces of Germany, the United States, France, England, Luxembourg, Belgium. He is now president of the Foundation of Science and Politics.

General Speidel's address is one of the clearest explanations I have heard of the strategic importance of Western Europe and reflects the knowledge of a man deeply schooled in the military and political history of Europe. He points out that the permanent aims of the Soviets are unchanging and warns us not to plan our defense according to the temporary policies forced on the Russians by momentary international developments.

It is also heartwarming to hear a Western European voice say that his countrymen appreciate that what we are doing in Vietnam is done for the freedom of all people.

General Speidel's speech will improve the understanding of all who read it and I urge my colleagues in the House to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I include General Speidel's address and General Lemnitzer's introduction as a part of my remarks:

REMARKS BY GEN. LYMAN L. LEMNITZER, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE, ON INTRODUCING GEN. HANS SPEIDEL AT THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE GERMAN FRIENDLY SOCIETY, FRANCIS MARION HOTEL, CHARLESTON, S.C., JANUARY 19, 1966

Mr. President, General Speidel, Congressman RIVERS, and gentlemen, the opportunity to be here tonight is extremely welcome to me, for several reasons.

To begin with, it is always a pleasure to return to Charleston. Some 25 years ago, in 1940, when I was stationed for a time at Fort Moultrie, I first became acquainted with this attractive and historic city. Since then I have had extensive contact with many Charlestonians. One of the most distinguished of these is my good friend and associate, with whom I have had close relationships for many years, Congressman RIVERS, who now occupies the highly important position of chairman of the vital House Armed Services Committee. In addition, General Clark, General Harris, and General Tucker, and a number of others with whom I have served in the Armed Forces and whom I admire have come to Charleston to make their homes on retiring from active military duty. For me, therefore, a return to Charleston is, in a sense, a sort of homecoming.

Beyond this, however, I regard it as a special privilege to be here in connection with the 200th anniversary of the German Friendly Society. For two centuries it has played a highly responsible and valuable part in the life of this city—lending vital aid in time of private need and public disaster, fostering education, serving patriotic causes, and promoting the fraternal virtues of fellowship and mutual assistance. Truly, it provides a splendid symbol of the combination of the best qualities associated with the German and American characters.

Finally, I consider it a signal honor to introduce to this audience a man of such outstanding attainments as its guest of honor tonight. The German Friendly Society of Charleston has in its time welcomed many distinguished visitors both from the United States and from abroad. I can assure you from my personal knowledge that Gen. Hans Speidel is fully worthy of their company.

As a sort of footnote to his presence here, I think it is an interesting fact that one of the society's original 16 members, who also served it as its clerk from 1767 through 1779, was a man named Abraham Speidel.

I do not know what connection, if any, this may reflect. I do know, however, that it is a privilege for all of us to be addressed by a man of such impressive and diverse achievements as General Speidel.

Entering the German Army in 1914, when he was only 17 years old, he served during World War I on the Western front. After earning his commission as an officer, he rose to be, successively, a company commander, then second-in-command of a battalion, and eventually a regimental staff officer.

Staying in the Regular Army after the war, he also carried on advanced studies in economics and history, and in 1925 was awarded the degree of doctor of philosophy, magna cum laude, by the University of Tübingen. Throughout the next several years he had a succession of assignments in command of troops and as a general staff officer.

In World War II, he took part in the campaign which ended with the allied evacuation at Dunkirk. For the allied side in World War II, that campaign is not the happiest of memories, but every student of military matters recognizes that in both conception and execution it was nothing less than brilliant. During the next 18 months, General Speidel was chief of staff of the military command for France; but by early 1942, because of his disapproval of the policies being imposed on the military authorities by the notorious security service, or S.D., he obtained a transfer to the eastern front, where he served until the following year as chief of staff of an army corps.

Later, he returned to the Western theater as chief of staff of General Rommel's army group. However, in early September of 1944, General Speidel was arrested on orders of Himmler, and was held in prison until he was liberated by the French First Army in the final week of the war in Europe.

With the war over, General Speidel turned to scholarly pursuits, becoming professor of modern history at Tübingen University. But the demand for his talents did not allow him to retire for long to a purely academic life. By the beginning of 1951 he was summoned to serve as a military adviser in conferences considering the contributions which the Federal Republic of Germany could make to the defense of Europe. This led to his appointment as the Federal Republic's Chief Military Delegate to the committee studying the proposal for a European Defense Community which was being considered at that time.

When the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Germany were established in 1955, he was the logical choice for their first commander.

Shortly over a year later, he was named to the position, under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, of commander in chief of all Allied land forces in the central region. In that assignment—which he was the first German officer to hold—he was in command of all or the bulk of the ground forces assigned to NATO not only by the Federal Republic of Germany, but also by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

General Speidel occupied this post of vital responsibility for almost 7 years. His departure from that assignment in September of 1963, however, did not mark an end to his contributions to the cause of European security.

On the contrary, he became, first, the Federal Republic's special adviser on matters of Atlantic defense, and later was chosen to be president of the Foundation of Science and Politics.

From this outline of General Speidel's career, it is obvious that he is a man of broad background and high attainment. I am sure that we shall be hearing today not solely from General Speidel or from Dr. Speidel. Rather, we shall be getting the benefit of the blend of knowledge and experience of a man of wide achievements, who represents in himself a rare combination of soldier, scholar, and statesman. I know that I speak for everyone here in saying that we look forward eagerly to his address.

General Speidel's Evening Address to German Friendly Society

My English will be easier for you to understand and will perhaps appear more familiar as well, if you will do me the courtesy of mistaking it for Pennsylvania Dutch.

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to address you today. We commemorate an important historical event, the 200th anniversary of the foundation of the German Friendly Society. I should like to thank you, above all, the president of the society, and Congressman Rivers, for having invited me to come to Charleston on this wonderful occasion.

I was grieved to learn of the untimely passing of Mr. Attaway, the former president of your society. We wrote to each other a number of times and he was most helpful in preparing me for this visit with you.

I would like to wish greatest success to the new president, Mr. Viohl.

I am deeply touched to be called to speak here to old friends, perhaps even to some relatives. Some of us have probably the same roots, since many of you came from my own home region, from Württemberg. More than 200 years ago, your ancestors came to South Carolina and brought with them your pioneer spirit, your creative strength, your customs and religion—let me only recall the founder of your society, Michael Kalteisen, my namesake Abraham Speidel, and so many others. It is in their spirit that I bring you today the greetings of the old country that does not forget you. I have been charged in particular to convey to you the best wishes of the president of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Lübre and of the German Chancellor, Prof. Dr. Ludwig Erhard.

Yours is indeed a proud city with a magnificent tradition. It makes me very happy to get acquainted with your town and its forthright and liberty-loving people.

Before saying some words about the German-American friendship and about the problems of the peace and of our mutual security, I wish to acknowledge a great debt. That we Germans have found our place in the political field, in Europe and in NATO, that we have been able to take upon ourselves responsibilities for the defense of the free world together with our allies, all this has been made possible only by your—by the United States—moral, human, and material help. Without this assistance, we could not have achieved our economic recovery and—to mention my own military profession—we would not have been able to set up our army, the Bundeswehr. We shall never forget this proof of true friendship you have conveyed through your support. We shall remain fully conscious of it.

We cannot deal today in detail with all the events that separated and united our peoples in the course of a history of more than 300 years. Your detachment from world affairs, which lasted roughly until 1917, has to be understood within the context of the atmosphere of the past centuries. Surrounded by two oceans, living on your own a hard existence, you have made of your country everything humanly possible.

However, since then, the two World Wars and the stormy technical boom have changed the situation completely. Today, you not only march on or, better, fly on the top of progress, but carry commitments and responsibilities for the whole free world.

Since the end of the Second World War our two nations have had to meet the same task of reconsidering the political situation and of finding ways and means to counter the steadily increasing dangers in the world. You, the United States, as the great protector of the Occident; we, the divided Germany, as the most exposed country in the conflict between East and West. Any foreign policy of our era cannot but be world policy. Thus, for us, historically a continental landpower, it is a basic new element to be an ally of the strongest landpower, airpower, and seapower of the Western World. This alliance originated in the East-West conflict, in particular in the war in Korea. Political considerations combined with a changing psychological attitude resulted in the pleasant climate between the United States and Germany.

A strong link in the German-American relations is NATO. By its creation the United States entered into an engagement in Europe, unknown before in history. The precondition for the foundation of NATO on American initiative one and a half decades ago remains unchanged; the threat to our existence continues to be the same.

The United States has successfully prevented the expansion of the Soviet system of society to Western Europe. Unfortunately, it has been imposed on the Eastern European countries and other areas like Cuba. The structure of society and foreign policy are interlaced. Each country with a Communist system of society necessarily becomes from the point of view of world policy a satellite, or at least an ally of the Soviet Union.

We realize full well what you did for us in Korea and what you are doing in Vietnam for the sake of freedom for all of us. We follow your battle wholeheartedly and appreciate it gratefully. As the German Chancellor stated last December 21, we Germans, and I quote, "are grateful to President Johnson and the American people for the sacrifices in blood and lives that the United States is making in Vietnam for the cause of freedom and for our freedom too. We feel a close solidarity with you."

Now, allow me to tell you something about my country, about the security of Europe and with it that of the Western World. As I mentioned earlier, the menace we face remains the same. The expansionist bid for world conquest of the Soviet Union continues to prevail. It is true that the Soviets reckon with longer periods of time and adapt themselves more to reality with its manyfold counteracting factors. Paramount among these factors is the economic and social stability which Western Europe has achieved. The ideological urge for expansion of the Soviet Union has nevertheless not vanished, nor the military pressure which results from it. The Soviet leaders consider the situation only more soberly.

Moreover, for the time being, they are forced by international political developments like their present tense relationship with Red China, the shifting of the main military conflicts to Asia, to desist from activating their political offensive against Europe. How long this condition will last is difficult to estimate. It would, therefore, be extremely dangerous to submit that they will remain peaceful forever and to renounce our military defense efforts. It would be even risky if we let considerations of detente determine our defense exclusively. Moreover, we have to keep in mind that Germany, being the immediate bordering area of the Soviet empire and a divided country, is in a special situation. One part of Germany is governed by a totalitarian Communist minority. This minority is not supported by its completely oppressed population, but is kept in power by the Soviet Union and is being used as an instrument of Russian world politics.

The political conception of the rulers in the Soviet occupied zone of Germany is based on the idea of spreading a civil war into the western part of the country. This conception is determined by the ideology of class struggle. The Communists are aiming at a violent overthrow in Western Germany. West Berlin, in its difficult situation, is particularly vulnerable. The Communist regime in the Eastern zone has notwithstanding to adapt its moves to the political interest and the security of the Soviet Union. They cannot, therefore, plunge at any given moment into expansionistic adventures. Nevertheless, they endanger the security of the Federal Republic of Germany and that of the whole Western World. We should be careful in talking prematurely about diminishing tensions just because there have been initiated some measures of relaxation. For the time being these measures concern almost exclusively the political atmosphere. The process of relaxation is only then a real one when the causes of the political conflicts have been settled by negotiations and compromises. A real detente requires inevitably the renunciation of the ideology of class struggle and antagonism which the Soviet Union is still pursuing with regard to the so-called capitalistic West.

The change in the attitude of the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the free world is not of a basic nature, but a mere tactical innovation as reflected in the doctrine of the so-called peaceful coexistence. Thus the Soviets use the question of disarmament as an instrument of their foreign policy. We often misunderstand that reductions and increases in armament are phenomena which do not exclude each other. Often they exist at the same time. Sometimes they even condition each other. This is the case when disarmament measures in one particular field do not result in a strengthening of the balance of power but lead to an unbalanced situation. Increased armament in some other field usually follows. Let us recall only the time between the two World Wars, the first era of disarmament conferences in Geneva. It cannot be excluded that we might possibly be entering again such an era of simultaneous disarmament and rearmament. In view of this we should try to avoid any confusion that such a situation might provoke. Let us not deceive ourselves and be the victims of a wrong feeling of security. Disarmament agreements in special fields unfortunately do not mean that eternal peace has been achieved. Peace can only be preserved if the West takes into account during the present disarmament negotiations with the Soviet Union, the military requirements which assure the existing balance of power and by that our security. Limitations of armament which impose on the West unilateral political and strategic disadvantages should not be envisaged. Thus disengagement plans in central Europe, as the Polish Rapacki-Gomulka plan, which is being promoted by Moscow, would inevitably lead to a recognition of the Soviet occupied zone of Eastern Germany and to a neutralization of the potential of the Federal Republic of Germany. This would be a disadvantage, which the West cannot afford.

A regional disarmament, a military thinning out or a demilitarization of specific areas in central Europe would provide the Soviet Union with decisive advantages because:

The vital centers of the West European community are within reach of the light air force and the medium range ballistic missiles stationed in Poland and western Russia.

A military vacuum can be filled far quicker by a totalitarian power than by a community of free countries. The former are able to camouflage their preparations and start their aggression all of a sudden.

The attraction that militarily unoccupied areas exercise on the Communist leadership is well known. Such an area would be a propitious target for their practice of subversive action and infiltration, as well as for the sending of so-called volunteers following a demand for help by a rioting minority. The paramilitary formations and organizations of the Eastern-bloc countries would gain in importance.

Under such circumstances a defense zone between the Rhine and the Atlantic would leave no space for a strategic return blow. The operational liberty of the West would thus be lost.

A departure of the U.S. Armed Forces from Europe would secure the superiority of the Soviet Union in conventional armed forces. The nuclear destitution of central Europe would trigger such a development. Once departed to the United States, it would take too much time to bring the American divisions back.

A disengagement of the forces of the two power blocs under the prevailing conditions would be equivalent to a renunciation to the security which the Atlantic Alliance has created with great sacrifices 16 years ago.

Disarmament negotiations, therefore, cannot be successful until the Soviet Union drops her unequivocal demands for a change of the military balance of power between West and East to her advantage.

The military problems of the defense of Europe lead us to the following thoughts about the strength of our potential Communist adversary: We should always be aware of the way of thinking of the opponent. The present and future importance of all nuclear means and possibilities occupies a major place in the Soviet strategic doctrines. They believe, however, that modern arms of mass destruction with intercontinental reach will not shorten a future war, but extend it in space and time. They therefore have not built up their long distance strategic arms at the cost of conventional armed forces. On the contrary, they dispose of armed forces which are equally ready for a nuclear as well as for a conventional war. I do not want to burden you with details of the Communist threat against Europe. Let me just mention the 700 bases of medium range ballistic missiles which are targeted on Western Europe. In summarizing, it may be said: there cannot be noticed any tendencies of retreat or reduction of forces, neither in the Soviet occupied zone of Germany nor anywhere else in Eastern Europe. The forces have stayed numerically the same. The material—tanks, planes, submarines—has been modernized. The satellite countries, including the Soviet zone of Eastern Germany, have been provided with nuclear-arm carriers. The strategic and tactical conceptions of the Soviets, their strength and equipment lead us to the conclusion that in case of war, they would pursue the following aims in central Europe:

The destruction of the allied nuclear capacity.

The destruction, or at least neutralization, of the NATO forces.

The occupation of the European countries in order to utilize their strategic possibilities and their economic resources.

Between the Iron Curtain and the River Seine there is, on 850,000 square kilometers, a conglomeration of population of 125 million and nearly the whole industrial and economic potential of continental Europe. There is the Ruhr district, the coal mines of the Saar and Belgium, the iron mines of Lorraine, the centers of heavy industry of Liege, Charleroi, Denain-Anzin, Pont-a-Mousson, Metz and Luxembourg, and in addition, five European ports: Hamburg, Bremen, Rotterdam, Antwerp, and Le Havre. If the Soviets could get hold of such an enormous industrial and economic potential they would have a definite superiority over the United States. This fact, among others, has created the link of common destiny between the United States and the free parts of Europe.

Divided Germany is most of all endangered. A glance over the wall in Berlin shows daily the distressing realities of the situation. The Soviet Union continues in her desire to make the division a permanent one, to include Berlin into the power sphere of the Soviet Zone, and to make the rest of Europe ripe for a Communist takeover. This danger has only been averted until now by the protection of the most powerful military force of the Western World, the United States of America. Without it, Europe cannot be defended for a long time to come.

Side by side with the 12 divisions of the Federal Republic of Germany and those of the other allies, the 7th American Army, with the greatest firepower ever achieved by an army on European soil, occupies the front line of our forward defense. Until a year and a half ago, it was under the command of my good friend Gen. Hugh Harris, now the president of the famous Citadel. He then bestowed on me the great honor of honorary membership in the 7th Army. For 6½ years, it had been under my command in my former capacity of commander of the land forces central Europe. This was a period of wonderful cooperation with your excellent officers and your admirable boys. It provided me personally with an unsurpassed military satisfaction.

The Supreme Allied Commanders in Europe, Generals Eisenhower, Ridgway, Gruenther, Norstad, and Lemnitzer, whom it is my great pleasure to see here today, symbolize the best tradition of your great military leaders: of Washington, Steuben, Lee, Patton. They are shining examples for us in their strength of character and qualities of leadership. They, as well as many of your Members of Congress, second to none Congressman Rivers, have always shown a great understanding for Germany's security requirements. Germany, as the most endangered country in Europe, needs the protection of the nuclear arms and has, of course, a fundamental interest in the defense planning for central Europe and in a shared responsibility within the NATO alliance.

We share the conceptions of the United States about coordination of foreign policies. Every military strategy presupposes a unity of will in foreign policy. Without this unity, no unity of strategy is possible. The alliance requires both.

Enough now, dear friends, of these things which trouble us daily. We are extremely thankful for your help and achievements. It is you who carry 75 percent of the entire defense expenses of the Western World, besides sending your boys abroad.

Our nations should never forget the words of General Eisenhower: "In the final choice, a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains."

Of course, we should not see the problems of defense unilaterally from the military point of view. All the problems of defense are determined by military, historical, political, economic, philosophical, and religious questions. We should keep in mind the scale of values we are standing for. On its first place rank moral values, a culture of long standing and the freedom of the individual. We have—precisely in this technological age—to make room for true personality and sidetrack petty functionaries. As the philosopher Karl Jasper puts it: "The spiritual contents of life should be stressed in the Western World more than until now, to distinguish it from the Communist East, where mere technical training is everything."

We soldiers have always had a saying: In the final run it is always the human being who battles. It is the individual we have to care about. It was in this sense that General Patton one said: "Wars may be fought with weapons but they are won by men. It is the spirit of men who follow and of the man who leads that gains the victory."

Let us act in accordance with these ideas and we will have in all fields of our constitutional and community life a true harmony, the lifeblood of democracy. Free in spirit and strong in character, we shall march into the future.

It is this spirit, dear friends of the German Friendly Society, that we feel with you. No nation has shown so much understanding for the security of the old world, for the liberty of Berlin and for the reunification of Germany as you have. You are today the true defenders of peace and liberty. We live indeed in an imperiled world, and the United States bears a tremendous responsibility. The man of our time has to prove that he is able to master the forces he himself has unleashed. We are full of admiration for your successes in all fields, especially in outer space, and we are convinced that together with you we will master the future. We share a common responsibility for the future of mankind and for our freedom, which is its basis. Let us face together our problems and difficulties and keep our friendship in the spirit of your song, "The Flag of Our Nation": United we stand, divided we fall.

The Late Honorable Herbert Bonner

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I join in the eulogies that have been accorded to my late friend and colleague, Herbert Bonner. Quiet, calm, and sensible, he was a faithful and devoted Member of this body. Always honorable and conscientious, Herbert commanded universal respect. With his passing I have lost a close personal friend, and the Nation has lost a valuable public servant. To the surviving family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

Appendix

A Connecticut Architect on Low-Rent Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record the text of an article "High Standards—Low Rental," about an interesting and successful low-rent housing project in my hometown of Putnam, Conn. This project may serve as a guide for similar housing projects in other areas, and for this reason I am inserting it into the Record.

The article was written by the late Arthur E. Thomas, who was a prominent architect in Norwich, Conn., and served as president of the Connecticut Society of Architects in 1963. He died last year. His article appeared in a recent issue of the Connecticut Architect:

High Standards—Low Rental: Hampshire Heights Housing, Putnam, Conn.

(By Arthur E. Thomas, architect)

Spectacular architecture can be breathtaking. Comfortable, people-oriented architecture can be breathgiving. Five years of use have proved out the planning, design, and administration which have resulted in an attractively maintained multiple dwelling community in northeastern Connecticut.

Government sponsored housing projects are not uncommon in this day, and they are seldom outstanding. Practical, utilitarian, sturdy, adequate—but not outstanding. In Putnam, Conn., the Hampshire Heights low-rental housing project may well be the exceptional variation from the rule.

Following the devastating 1955 flood, some 11 acres of farm and pasture land on the outskirts of the city of Putnam were designated for emergency housing use. The site is somewhat hilly and contained a wooded area. The vision of Putnam's then Mayor John Dempsey and Housing Authority Chairman Robert W. Bulger, translated into a concrete design by Architect Arthur E. Thomas, of Norwich, has been completely justified by time.

At the groundbreaking ceremony in May 1958, the first shovels of earth were turned by Senator (then Governor) Abraham Ribicoff and Gov. (then mayor) John Dempsey. Connecticut's Governor Dempsey played an active part in the preliminary project work, as did Attorney William St. L. Onge, U.S. Congressman from the Putnam area who also provided much of the initial motivating force.

As common in such public works, State and Federal agency requirements and an extremely limited budget sharply circumscribed the scope of the architect's design efforts. For example, a proposal to incorporate post and beam construction had to be dropped because one of the agencies involved was unfamiliar with this type of work and would not consider it. In the words of Architect Thomas, the project "can almost be considered a victory for the State and Federal agencies involved" rather than a special architectural achievement.

Despite these problems, very livable apartment housing was provided. It is well arranged in plan, comfortable and modern, and contains all essential facilities. The project consists of 28 buildings with four to six dwelling units in each building. Of the total 124 units, 12 are one-bedroom, 12 are four-bedroom, and there are 50 each of two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Each unit has its own basement where many tenants have installed playrooms and workshops, and each has its own front and rear yard. In many instances, tenants have done extensive landscaping to improve their homes.

A central community facility houses the heating plant, mechanical equipment and services, a social hall and kitchen, and administrative offices of the housing authority.

All buildings are of brick veneer construction with built-up bonded flat roofs. The heating system is forced hot water with cast iron radiation and central temperature controls. Windows are double-hung aluminum. Buildings are two-story duplex, with one-bedroom apartments forming one-story additions to some buildings.

The paved roads and walks connect to city streets, and are well lighted. Storm and sanitary sewer lines are also connected to the city system, and fire protection is provided. Within the project site, existing trees were retained in the landscaping wherever possible, and new ones added sparingly. Playground areas and clothes drying yards are included in the plan.

Interior walls are plastered, and except for kitchens and bathrooms all floors are hardwood.

In a bare description of the physical elements of this low-rental apartment home complex, there is little to distinguish it from countless others across the land. It might, in fact, be classed as a typical public housing project with everyday functional design, built within a limited budget. But, there is a difference which is a credit to Putnam and to the people who make their homes at Hampshire Heights.

Today, the apartments have been occupied for 5 years. They contrast sharply with many other similar projects which have depreciated and regressed in the same number of years or less. The feelings of the tenants are manifested in many ways unusual in this type of housing.

Flower gardens abound in season, and each plot is maintained in true neighborhood fashion—by the occupants, not by the housing authority. Many physical improvements have been lovingly made by the tenants at their own expense and labor.

In part, this happy result is due to the planning and thought given to placing the buildings on the site. Advantage was taken of the terrain, leaving it as natural as possible. Trees were incorporated in the landscaping program which took every advantage of the existing assets. The open areas give a feeling of roominess rather than man-made stripped land. Although of the same design, each building seems to fit the environment and have individual character.

Equally, if not more important, is the attitude of the housing authority and its chairman, Robert W. Bulger. Sometimes referred to as "Mr. Housing Authority," he has somehow managed to instill in the tenants of this particular low-rental project a pride of ownership and an appreciation of what they have in Hampshire Heights. It is unusual, if not unique.

Even the name has a particular flavor. Following the 1955 flood in Putnam, the State of New Hampshire offered aid in the form of temporary housing and financial assistance. The streets of Hampshire Heights are named after New Hampshire towns.

The buildings were constructed by H. U. Ball & Sons of Southbridge, Mass., whose low bid for the job was $1,425,900.

The success of this development project which has appreciated in appearance and value over the years has encouraged the community to undertake another low-rental project which is now on the drawing boards. In addition, nearby is an apartment complex for elderly people, also designed by Arthur Thomas and sponsored by the Putnam Housing Authority.

"I am very proud of this low-income project. It is not an architectural gem because it was designed to meet a basic required specification. The limited budget meant we had to work within a narrow design concept, closely administered by Federal agency representatives. It is, however, sound practical architecture which will provide good, comfortable homes for its tenants for many years to come," Mr. Thomas said.

Soviet Colonialism in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in admiration of the more than 10,000 Minnesotans of Ukrainian descent and all U.S. Ukrainians, I wish to note the observance on January 22 of another Ukrainian Independence Day. I believe that American foreign policy should have as its ultimate goal the right of freedom of national determination for people everywhere and this is a policy we are today vigorously defending in southeast Asia. Unfortunately, there are few people on the globe more deserving of this right, or who have been more consistently deprived of it, than the Ukrainians.

The rich Ukrainian lands have been a prize for conquerors for many centuries, but the Ukrainian people have always dreamed of independence and the right to mold their own destiny.

This desire has never seemed more remote than under the present Ukrainian condition, which sees the Ukraine as a state entirely subsurvient to the Soviet Union. Article 67 of the Soviet Constitution reads:

> The decisions and decrees of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. are binding for the whole territory of the U.S.S.R.

This does not prevent Soviet propagandists from speaking of the Ukraine as "the sovereign and independent Ukrainian SSR," nor does it impede the Soviets from gaining an extra seat in the United Nations by exploiting the myth of Ukrainian independence.

After the Russian revolution of 1917, the Ukrainian people formed a revolutionary parliament in Kiev, declaring independence. In 1918, the Ukrainians fought the Red Army for independence. Having defeated the Red Army, it had to, in turn, fight the White Army which was attempting to reinstate the czarist regime. The Ukrainians were defeated, but the White Russians fell, in turn, to the Red Army. In 1920, the Ukrainian People's Republic attempted to liberate the Ukraine from Bolshevism with the aid of Poland, only to again be divided between Russia, Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia. At the end of World War II, the entire Ukrainian region ended up in the Soviet Union.

The Ukraine is, of course, of great economic importance to the Soviet Union. The Ukraine provides Moscow with some 55 percent of its iron ore, 52 percent of its pig iron, 40 percent of its steel, 41 percent of its rolled ferrous metal, 34 percent of its coal, and 61 percent of its sugar. It is the second largest producer in the Soviet Union of meat, milk, and grain.

To lose this economic wealth would be a serious blow to Moscow's world ambitions. But those who may be tempted to believe Soviet charges of colonialism against the West, which has given up the vast bulk of its colonial holdings, should also remember the sad fate of the Ukrainians under the yoke of Russian colonialism.

Have You Registered To Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1964, I introduced a bill designed to encourage greater voter participation in our national elections. It was my contention then, as it is now, that this could be accomplished by authorizing the Postmaster General to establish a special postal cancellation mark bearing the words "Have You Registered To Vote?" The 88th Congress adjourned without taking action on my bill.

I introduced the postal cancellation bill in the firm belief that it would be an excellent way to encourage the American people to go to the polls. The 1964 elections did nothing to change my opinion. The desirability of constantly reminding voters of the need to register and vote remains important, and I am today reintroducing my postal cancellation bill.

Most of us are familiar with the public services performed by the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council and their efforts to encourage Americans to vote. Their campaign for increased registration and greater voter participation at the polls has been based on this slogan:

> Vote—and the choice is yours. Don't vote—and the choice is theirs. Register—or you have no choice.

Despite the efforts of the American Heritage Foundation and the Advertising Council, as well as those of both of our great political parties and other groups, registration and voter turnout were not as large in 1964 as had been hoped.

Of the nearly 114 million Americans of voting age only 70,643,526 voted for President on November 4, 1964. This means that only 62 percent of this country's eligible voters were interested enough and took the time to cast ballots in the 1964 presidential election. Not only was the turnout well below expectations, but it also represented a decline in percentage compared with the 63.8 percent turnout in 1960. This is a record which leaves much to be desired.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we must have greater participation in our democratic system if we are to have a truly representative government. I suggest that one way to promote more participation would be through passage of the postal cancellation bill which I am introducing today.

After introducing this legislation in 1964, I wrote to Mr. Theodore S. Repplier, president of the Advertising Council, and Mr. Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, president of the American Heritage Foundation, advising them of my interest in this subject and requesting their views on my bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the responses I received from Mr. Repplier and Mr. Brophy, as well as the text of my bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL, INC.,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1964.

Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you very much for your letter of July 1. We greatly appreciate your commendation in connection with the forthcoming register and vote campaign.

It seems to me that the bill you have introduced, H.R. 10580, contains an excellent idea. Naturally, we are all for it and wish you success with it. The only difficulty would seem to be coordinating it with the registration periods in the various States which, as you know, tend to differ considerably. In some States, I believe, they go on into October.

With kindest regards.

Cordially,

T. S. REPPLIER.

THE AMERICAN HERITAGE
FOUNDATION,
New York, N.Y., July 7, 1964.

Hon. JAMES G. O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your letter of July 1 commending the American Heritage Foundation for sponsoring the current drive to encourage a larger turnout at the polls is very much appreciated.

The foundation has been conducting these campaigns for a number of years and with considerable success, but it requires constant effort and continuing work to maintain the level of citizen participation in our political process.

We heartily endorse H.R. 10580 which you introduced in the Congress in March of this year. The special canceling stamp or postmark bearing the words "Have you registered to vote?" used in all first and second class post offices would indeed be a great help in publicizing the importance of registration.

There is one other thing that might be done and it is quite possible that you could help if you approve. I am enclosing one of the poster advertisements prepared for this year's campaign by the Advertising Council. This message will appear in many magazines and newspapers during September and October and will be seen on television programs and heard on many radio programs. It would be wonderful if we could persuade the Post Office Department to permit the use of the panels on mail delivery trucks for displaying this message in the month of October.

We would be glad to supply the posters if it could be arranged with the Post Office Department. I would greatly appreciate your views on what we might be able to do to bring this about.

Thanks again for your cordial letter. We would be happy to do anything you suggest to support your proposal and will be glad to write to anyone whom you might suggest.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS D'ARCY BROPHY,
President.

Community Antenna Television Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Federal Communications Commission regulation of community antenna television service is a matter of great concern to some 300 of my constituents, who have written me the following letter which I would call to the attention of this body for its consideration:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HUNGATE: I subscribe to a community antenna service (CATV) in Kirksville, Mo., because it provides more stations and clearer pictures than I can receive otherwise. Without CATV, color reception is poor or impossible in Kirksville.

The Federal Communications Commision is prepared to upset my family's television viewing habits by restricting the present service provided by the CATV system.

I understand they are taking this action without the authority of Congress, and even without the same thorough study of the CATV industry undertaken by the Senate and House subcommittees. Congress has studied the industry but has not reached a conclusion. How can the FCC, without thorough study and hearings take such action?

I understand the necessity of controlling transmission of radio and television, but am appalled to learn that an agency of the Government now proposed to dictate which of the signals in the air I can watch.

Please convey my concern to Congressman Walter Rogers and support any efforts he might undertake to stop the FCC's actions. A letter or call from you to Chairman Henry would also be helpful.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joe A. Allen,
Kirksville, Mo.

Hawaii, a Growing Market for Korean Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the power and strength of the free world is dependent in large measure on the power and strength of each nation that comprises the community of free and independent powers.

We are therefore especially gratified to see an ally make rapid progress toward becoming a strong, economically independent nation. Such a country is our stanch ally, the Republic of Korea, which has been making deep inroads toward attaining economic self-sufficiency.

In a recent article written by Toni Withington of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, South Korean Consul D. Y. Lee said that Korea has exported an estimated $170,000 worth of Korean goods to my own State of Hawaii in 1965, which is $50,000 more than the 1964 figure. The most recent item that has contributed toward the increased exports is the ukulele, originally a Portuguese musical instrument which is identified today with all Hawaiian music. Our State of Hawaii has been a growing market not only for the "Made in Korea" stamped ukuleles, but also for imported Korean foods.

We are indeed happy to be able to help Korea improve her economic position. I should like to submit for inclusion in the Congressional Record the article written by Toni Withington, which appeared in the Wednesday, January 12, 1966, issue of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

[From the Honolulu (Hawaii) Star-Bulletin, Jan. 12, 1966]

The Korean Ukulele: At $2.99, a Good Start

(By Toni Withington)

The plinkety-plunk of the ukulele is musically signaling another nation added to its cosmopolitan history.

The Portuguese instrument that became an internationally known symbol of Hawaii and an economic boon for Japan is now being stamped "Made in Korea."

The initial success of the low-cost Korean ukulele is only in Hawaii, but it may be a happy indication of a new economic blossoming in the Republic of South Korea.

At $2.90, the darkwood ukulele competes favorably with higher-priced Japanese and American ukuleles that it copies.

ENTERED MARKET LAST YEAR

"We started buying the Korean ukuleles when they entered the market last year after an 8- or 9-month scaracity of inexpensive ukuleles," said R. D. Smith of Longs Drug Stores, which sells them locally.

"The New York World's Fair bought out thousands of the ukuleles from Japan and we were really hard pressed to find them," he said.

Long, at Ala Moana Shopping Center, has sold more than 600 of the Korean instruments. Other branches also sell them.

The Japanese ukuleles have reentered the Hawaiian market, but have found they must share it with Korean ukuleles and guitars.

"Korea is making many things Japan makes, with the same price and the same or higher quality," said *Charles Lee, vice president* of KBS Trading Co., Hawaii's largest importer of Korean merchandise.

BOUGHT IN KOREA FOR $1.45 EACH

Lee's company buys the ukuleles from the Korean manufacturer for $1.45. It ships the instruments here, paying a 34-percent duty on the way.

"Last year was great. Our merchandise was really going strong," Lee said.

Korean Consul D. Y. Lee estimated that Korea exported more than $170,000 worth of goods, most of it Korean foods, to Hawaii last year. This was a jump of more than $50,000 over 1964. Most of that increase was consumer goods.

Such an influx of Korean items may be only a small indication of the goods, especially electronic goods, that will soon rival Japan's on the world market, according to the report in the newspapers.

TWO NEW KOREAN FACTORIES

The report heralded the near completion of two new Korean factories which will produce household electronic equipment.

The Korean ukuleles, like most of the Korean merchandise, are competing with Japanese goods on a market once belonging chiefly to Japanese firms.

"The Korean ukes have driven down the price of the Japanese ones," Smith said. "For their money they are very good. They do have a slight problem with the peg screw. We had 15 complaints from the 600 we sold.

"Of course, the $16 Kamaka ukulele definitely sounds better, but the customer must ask himself whether it sound $13 better."

Samuel K. Kamaka of Kamaka & Sons, Honolulu ukulele makers, agrees that the cheaper ukuleles are "passable," but the tone is "an entirely different type of sound."

"The $3 and $4 ones are more like toys. We could never compete with them pricewise," he said.

SOME ARE GOOD, SOME ARE BAD

Some of the (Korean) ukes are very good and some are very bad, said Alfred Harned, a ukulele teacher at Harry's Music Store in Kaimuki.

"They seem to be able to copy the design of the good American ukes, but the quality is not always there," he said.

"But some of the cheaper ukuleles compare favorably to the Kamaka ukuleles," Harned added.

Other Korean goods compare favorably, too. According to the Korean consulate, last year Hawaii imported items from pianos to sewing machines, from bright silk shirts to plastic raincoats. Korean handicrafts have met a ripe market, he said.

ISLE UKULELES SOLD IN JAPAN

But because Korean and Japanese ukuleles are selling so well here, Sam Kamaka has decided to sell his ukuleles in Japan.

He recently completed arrangements to manufacture one model of the Kamaka koa wood ukulele in Japan to sell to the Japanese.

Aiding Leukemia-Stricken American Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to report that our youth in Vietnam have no corner on dedication and service. A recent example of this took place in my district, where a 16-year-old schoolgirl from Pacoima spearheaded an effort to organize the Nation's first junior chapter of a nationwide group called Aiding Leukemia-Stricken American Children (ALSAC). This charitable organization—with chapters in all major U.S. cities—collects funds annually through a teenagers march and turns them over to the famed St. Jude Hospital in Memphis, Tenn., where important research work into such diseases as leukemia is going on constantly.

The young lady in question is Donna Eubank, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence B. Eubank, and a student at Polytechnic High School. For 2 years Donna worked as a member, then cochairman and finally as chairman of the Teen-Agers March for ALSAC in the community of Pacoima. Her efforts in the 1965 campaign were so effective that Pacoima, not the richest nor the largest community in my district, led all the others in the amount of contributions, roughly one-sixth of the total. Television star Danny Thomas, whose work for St. Jude Hospital is well-known, paid Donna and her fellow workers a resounding and deserved tribute after this year's drive.

Now Donna is well on her way to having the Nation's first junior ALSAC chapter organized and operating.

Through this new youth-oriented organization, Donna believes she and her fellow ALSAC volunteers can involve still more teenagers, and keep them active and motivated throughout the year, rather than just during the teenagers' march every October. In her work, of course, she has had the help of others, and she took time out recently to salute some of these people at a public awards ceremony in Pacoima. There, certificates of merit and honorary membership in ALSAC were presented to community leaders of such groups as the chamber of commerce and the local Moose Lodge, among others.

In the year ahead, the Pacoima junior ALSAC chapter will be holding various teenage activities—dances, talent shows, and cookouts—and Donna's fertile brain is at work on setting up a teen club somewhere in the Pacoima area to attract still more ALSAC volunteers. In some respects, this long-range challenge is even more difficult than the organizational chores, but from what we have seen of Donna Eubank, no challenge is too great.

H.R. 12040: A Means of Protecting Laboratory Animals From Avoidable Pain, Fear, and Stress, Without Impeding Necessary Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H.R. 12040, a bill to provide for the humane treatment of research animals.

For some time now evidence has been provided the Congress by doctors, researchers, and their technicians establishing the fact that animals in some research laboratories are being subjected to unnecessary suffering, pain, fear, and stress, and are being housed and cared for in appalling and atrocious conditions. Researchers themselves have told me, "Some deplorable conditions have existed up to now, but we are trying to improve."

That statement is one reason why I have introduced H.R. 12040. I not only want to protect animals in our research laboratories from such deplorable conditions, but I want to see the benefits to research which will stem from legislation designed to correct these deplorable conditions. As a civilized nation we cannot sit by any longer and allow unnecessary suffering to be inflicted on any living being when we have the power to prevent it. Let me make it very clear from the beginning, Mr. Speaker, my bill is in no way an antivivisectionist bill. It will not impede necessary research. It is not an antiscience bill; it is an anticruelty bill.

H.R. 12040 incorporates seven basic principles:

First. An independent Office of Laboratory Animal Welfare will be established not only to formulate and administer the regulatory provisions of this act but also to work constructively to improve conditions in laboratories by conducting studies, disseminating information, providing training programs, which will contribute to the most productive and reliable scientific results from the use of research animals under optimum humane conditions.

Second. The best care will be provided for all laboratory animals in comfortable uncramped quarters with adequate space and facilities for normal exercise and food, water, sanitation, ventilation, temperature, lighting, and handling as is appropriate and normal to each species.

Third. Pain and discomfort will be reduced to the utmost minimum by issuance of directives requiring the use of humane techniques. Painful procedures will be allowed only when absolutely necessary as a means of directly achieving the alleviation of suffering, the prolongation of life, the prevention and cure of disease, or the promotion of national safety, and only when there is no less painful way to accomplish the purpose. Interested scientists and animal welfare organizations will be consulted for their recommendations in these determinations of what is necessary and what is the least painful way of proceeding, thus bringing the best minds in the country to bear in this problem of infliction of pain.

Fourth. The number of animals used for research will be reduced by promoting improvements in experimental design, the substitution of nonsentient materials or less sensitive forms of life for higher forms, the elimination of needless duplication of experiments, and the elimination of worthless experiments.

Fifth. This broad coverage will be extended to virtually every laboratory in which animals are used, not only to Government laboratories and institutions receiving Federal funds but also to laboratories making and testing products for interstate commerce and for sale to the Federal Government.

Sixth. Effective enforcement measures will be maintained including eligibility requirements for individual experimenters, special rules for students, certification of laboratory heads, required pertinent records, unannounced inspections, and penalties for noncompliance including loss of Government grants and funds, revocation or suspension of certificates or loss of the privilege to use animals in any laboratory covered by this act.

Seventh. Recommendations will be sought from interested scientists and animal welfare organizations, thus enabling humanitarians and scientists to participate in establishing the highest standards of humane care and use of research animals.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12040 will provide protection on all levels to insure that laboratory animals are housed and cared for humanely and spared avoidable pain, fear, and stress, but it will accomplish this without impeding necessary research. Just as safeguards are woven into the bill to protect the animals, so are safeguards woven into the bill to protect valid research.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12040 is the companion bill to that introduced by Representatives PAUL ROGERS of Florida; LEO O'BRIEN, of New York; WILLIAM SPRINGER, of Illinois; OLIVA HUOT, of New Hampshire; WILLIAM RANDALL, of Missouri; CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida; and Senators THOMAS MCINTYRE, of New Hampshire; and BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana. The bill that we have introduced is supported by the two largest national humane societies of the humane movement, The Humane Society of the United States and the American Humane Association. Thus, this legislation has strong congressional support and the strongest support of humanitarians throughout the United States. I sincerely hope that it will receive early passage.

Col. Frank Borman Day in Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, over 200,000 people greeted Gemini Astronaut Colonel Borman in his home city, Gary, Ind.

This editorial from Gary's Post Tribune recalls a few recollections from the colonel on space future possibilities:

TECHNOLOGY AND TACTICS

It's a long way from Gary's Col. Frank Borman Day to the rice paddies of Vietnam, and there are vast differences between a helicopter and a space capsule—and yet there are connections.

The awkward, slow-moving helicopter was regarded as a freak at its inception. First suggestions of its military potential brought laughs. Standpatters admitted it might have some value as a rescue vehicle, but feared it would be too much a sitting-duck target for tactical military value. Still, some who prefer innovation pressed on and the Marine tactic of "vertical envelopment" in which copter-borne fighting men are droned in behind enemy lines was adopted as theory.

Well, this week the Army which has had a real chance to test this concept in the long, dreary struggle in Vietnam had a special press conference in Washington. Among the startling statistics was the fact that only 62 choppers had been lost in 1,100,000 sorties flown in that jungle fighting.

Where Borman and Borman Day come into the picture is that one of the questions asked the astronaut here was about the potential military value of space capsules. The question was so phrased as to indicate a space capsule would be invulnerable to ground attack.

Borman made three points in his answer: (1) That, contrary to the asker's views, any fixed orbit vehicle would be susceptible to attack; (2) that the space program was primarily devoted to peaceful exploration, not the military, but (3) that any new developments—Borman went back and cited the automobile—could be adapted to military use.

In other words, while the space program is essentially peaceful as of now, the Government is not blinding itself to its military potential. In another context Borman that same day made the point that the entire space program is an "instrument of national policy" which must be fitted in where high authorities decide.

And in awarding medals to Borman and his three fellow rendezvousing astronauts in Houston late in December, James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), made a salient point. It was that the President's "strong initiatives" in his peace offensive were "made possible at least to some degree by the fact that all the world saw in Gemini 6 and 7 a magnificent capability to use machines and men * * *."

The connection is that American technological skill coupled with tactical ingenuity—whether helicopters or space capsules are involved—is sufficiently impressive to make even the Communist nations often pause to think.

Excerpts From Remarks of Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall at Kenosha, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, our country's determined and forceful fighter against pollution and the desecration of our country's great natural resources, harnessed a startling collection of facts to an engaging style of presentation on November 8, 1965, in a speech before nearly 1,000 people in Wisconsin's First District. He spoke at a testimonial dinner give in my honor in Kenosha, Wis., at the Eagles Club.

Secretary Udall is catching the ear of America in telling the Nation what it needs to preserve its resources, its beauty, and the inspiring qualities of the country. It is gratifying to have a man of such great drive and high intelligence guiding this Nation's program of conservation in these immediate critical times.

I know my colleagues will enjoy sharing a portion of his excellent presentation:

This year of 1965 has been, in my judgment, a year of incredible climax in terms of the accomplishments. It involved the teamwork of a President of the United States and a Congress of the United States.

If you will look at it for a moment, this great high tide that washed ashore this year as a result of Democratic leadership in the Congress and in the White House has resolved most of the great issues that have been before the American people in this whole postwar period since the end of World War II. It was Harry Truman himself, two decades ago, who first talked about or sketched in what we now call medicare. Who said there was a need to change our immigration laws and make them more equitable and more Democratic? Who talked about aid to education, and the need for civil rights in this country? The American Congress. And yet, as we talked and argued in the Congress, in the country these issues were the battleground politically.

Today, the 89th Congress has done something about these things. And, I think that you can look back with great satisfaction in the fact that your Congressman was one of those who made these great programs possible—that you had people in the Congress and in the Senate of the United States representing you. They participated vigorously and actively in providing the leadership to make these programs move forward.

And so, the question that we're confronted with, since it is this type of leadership that made the difference this year, is whether we can, as a party, move on from here, or are we going to rest on these laurels? I say it is contrary to our tradition to ever feel that the American people have achieved enough, or have done enough in terms of achieving that measure of excellence which should be expected of the greatest democracy of the world.

Six years ago there were two deeply imbedded traditions of American politics that, in my judgment, did more to diminish and limit the meaning of democracy in this country than almost anything else that affected our national political life. The first was a tradition that no Catholic could be President of this country. The second, a tradition of nearly a hundred years' duration, was that no one from the southern tier of States could be President. This was far from the American political folkways. It has been proven that these truisms of American political life were wrong, that American democracy was a larger and more expansive thing than this. Therefore, we nominated two men in the year of 1960—one a Catholic, and the other a person from the southern tier of our country. These two men, by a tragic accident of history, by a combination of teamwork between them, have exploded these two myths of American politics. I would simply say to you that I think as a result of this and the Democratic ideas in our country, that the American people are stronger and that our political system is stronger. I think this is something in which we should take a very special pride at this time.

But, let me speak for a few minutes about what I said are to be new issues in which our party will provide leadership. Having resolved many of these basic questions about our economy, about our social life and our political life, where do we go from here? There may be those in this country today who think that we are doing so well that we have moved up on a new plateau and we should complacently be satisfied with what we have. And, in truth, there is much to be satisfied about. I suppose this is the danger, because in terms of whether you measure it by a standard of living or gross national production, or the wages of workers, or the comforts and luxuries available, or the mobility of American people, or our military power, or the performance of our economic system, we are the richest and most powerful country in the history of the world, no question about it. But the question is, is this enough?

This is a rich society, but is it a Great Society? What will people say if we were to settle this as an American performance at this point? Would the historians say that we were a great civilization, that we left an example for other generations to come that was imitated, or must we go ahead and rebuild our cities and make them cities of which we can be proud? I am afraid this is not true in the man of America today.

Lest we do great new things, the type of things Senator Gaylord Nelson talks about, preaches about and acts for, and Representative Lynn Stalbaum, too, in conservation, in terms of achieving an America that contains the very best in terms of resources and out of doors, are we going to go ahead and build our educational system into something that is not just good, but truly great?

Are we going to do as your Congressman suggests—see to it that the American granary is a granary for the hungry people of the world and to let our affluence and wealth ripple out into other parts of the world and help these people lift themselves up, as they must, if we are to have a stable world. These are only some of the issues that we're confronted with today. And I could discuss this at length because its the thing that I preach about week in and week out. I am talking about some of the conservation objectives that we think are so vital if our country is to preserve some of these essential things that add an indispensable element to American life. Basically, we have been a people that loved and treasured the things of the land—you people in this part of the world, particularly.

I attended a water pollution conference in Detroit only last Saturday, called by the United Auto Workers, with an indication that they are going to crusade on this subject, and Senator Nelson and I were discussing this on the plane, coming in today, because every American who is concerned about leaving a legacy to his children that is at least as good or better than he inherited, knows that one of the great tasks that we are confronted with in this country is the task of pollution, of contamination of air and water, and of our whole environment. This is an area of great failure. We must face this as a fact. You only have to look at your own Great Lakes as a threat, particularly Lake Erie. I know that Lake Michigan is not Lake Erie, but it is subject to the same laws of nature, and that should be a sufficient warning to you.

As recently as 5 years ago, just with one variety of commercial fish in Lake Erie, there was harvested by commercial fishermen, fishery products worth over $1½ million. Last year the value was $120. That is a lake that is seriously threatened. Its very vitality and life is in danger today. Of course, this is repeated all across the land. There came to my desk only last week a brochure of a newly formed organization in one of the most superb settings of the United States. It calls itself the League to Save Lake Tahoe, and if any of you have ever seen Lake Tahoe, you know of the great beauty that is there. Yet, it is threatened, too. This is a story that I can tell over and over again.

So, whether we talk about saving some of our remaining superb seashore areas or lakeshore areas, such as your Apostle Islands, as Senator Nelson and Congressman Stalbaum have proposed; whether we talk about adding to our National Park Systems or saving forests, wildlife areas nearby for people to enjoy; whether we talk about our fisheries or preserving our wildlife or saving the best of our wild rivers as trout streams and outdoor areas for people to enjoy, we're talking about your tomorrow. There's a big job to do.

I read a story to my young boys a few months ago. It was a best seller a couple years ago, and if some of you haven't read it, get it and read it to your children. The story is about a man now late in life, and his boyhood in southern Wisconsin and northern Illinois, 50 years ago. It's a story about a young boy and his pet raccoon. You only have to read it to realize what we have eliminated, and what we are lacking in our life today, in terms of the relationship of people and thier environment. I also read something the other day that one of your people from this part of the United States wrote. He is Eric Sevareid, one of the most eloquent spokesmen today. Let me read you this, because he wrote it after he went out on a duck hunt in the Chesapeake Bay area a few months ago:

"We spend our frenzied lives, most of us, feeling east or west of Eden, but never in it. Its identity depends upon our particular obsession and concern, and mine increasingly with the years, is for the lands and waters of America. They are wasted in soil by crowding and greed and heedless habits until one despairs of one's children's inheritance. It is the spreading of concrete over the land * * * greedy commercialization of mountain valleys, the poisoning of rivers by cities, sewage, and industrial wastes, their sickening scourging of the American land. If all this is not checked and regulated as severely as hunting and fishing are limited now, our grandchildren will read about an America where the geese once filled the sky over Chesapeake Bay and where the great buffalo herds roamed, but they will never see it." This is his indictment of the present time.

So, there is a great work to be done; there are areas of failure where we must move in with new successes in the conservation field. I can talk to you about so many of these areas, about the need to do something about preserving the history of this country.

We're talking about preserving trails all over the land, perhaps some of them that would follow the early pioneering trails—the Lewis and Clark Trail, the Oregon Trail—the trails that richly lead into this country, so that young men and women on foot, on horseback, on bicycle, could move through the land. This is the concept embodied in me, and I say it's a proposal that we're going to view tomorrow.

I think that I sense in the American people, in this part of the land particularly, an unwillingness to settle for mere material accomplishments, however important they are to us. I think there is a yearning in the American people for true greatness. * * *

Beauty Is the Topic of the Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to an article which appeared in the January 1966 edition of the Wisconsin Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Review, detailing the visit of Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall to that organization's Kenosha affiliate meeting on November 8, 1965.

The Secretary and Mrs. Stalbaum and I were the guests of Vi Christensen, Kenosha, the gracious and highly capable program chairman who is a leader in her field.

The Kenosha affiliate is part of the National Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Association which offers, as a part of its excellent, overall program, unfortunate women and children in hospitals and institutions throughout the United States an opportunity to improve their appearances during National Beauty Salon Week.

I commend the Kenosha affiliate for putting its talents to this fine purpose and for its dedicated work in its community.

The article follows:

[From the Wisconsin Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Review, January 1966]

U.S. SECRETARY OF INTERIOR UDALL VISITS KENOSHA

Members of the Kenosha affiliate were honored when the U.S. Secretary of the Interior addressed their meeting which was held on November 8 at the Midway Motor Lodge in Kenosha. As Mr. Udall said, "My work as Secretary of the Interior on President Lyndon Johnson's Cabinet is to make America beautiful, so is it your duty to make the women of America beautiful." Mr. Udall was visiting Kenosha due to the fact that there was a testimonial dinner for Representative LYNN STALBAUM, First District Congressman from Wisconsin, that same evening. Mr. and Mrs. Stalbaum were invited to the hairdressers meeting so suggested that Mr. Udall might also enjoy coming. This was indeed a great honor made especially so by the interesting address by both Mr. Udall and Congressman STALBAUM.

Margaret Vinci Heidt, of Chicago, who was the guest artist instructor of the evening invited Mrs. Stalbaum to be her model for a recomb. Her husband approved of the restyle and praised the cosmetologists for their efforts.

The members of the affiliate were thrilled and excited as Secretary Udall is the first U.S. Cabinet member to visit Kenosha in many years. All agreed, after the visit, that National Beauty Salon Week would have added meaning in view of the fact that its purpose is to keep all women everywhere in the United States beautiful. National Beauty Salon Week will continue to offer the unfortunate women and children in hospitals and institutions a chance to improve their appearance through the efforts of members of the National Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Association throughout the United States. All State and local affiliate NBSW chairmen are urged to follow through on their instructions to gather the publicity stories from the news media in each area including the dates of publication and send to the State NBSW chairman, Dorothy Field, Janesville. Mrs. Fields is also a vice president of the Wisconsin Hairdressers & Cosmetologists Association. National Beauty Salon Week begins February 13 and ends February 19 and it is the largest single industry promotion in the United States.

The importance of the visit by Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, was emphasized by the presence of Secret Service men and plainclothes officers who waited in the hall while he was attending the meeting. However, there was nothing austere about this popular gentleman's presence. His friendly, gracious manner and stimulating talk assured everyone that we are all in this project together to "make America beautiful."

Victims of Farm Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, high school and college age people often come up with some of the most refreshing and stimulating ideas of all, perhaps because their imaginations are so free to run wild.

A group of these young people recently got to talking about Government aid. They concluded that one of the reasons for the great migration of people in this country from the farm to the city has been the massive programs of Government aid to farms over the past years.

Victims of farm assistance, they said, have tried to escape to the city where they hope to have a better chance to be free of bureaucratic control, and generally live more independently of the Federal Government.

But now, these young folks said, the Government is moving into the city in strength. We will have rent subsidies, Federal playgrounds, job-hunting bureaus for people who are already employed, Federal teachers, and goodness knows what all.

We already have a Job Corps program we can get into if we can manage to drop out of school. And they have started a computerized matching system for getting dates. We won't even have to worry about who to go out with: the Feds will handle everything.

Someone in the group asked if the Federal teachers would be required to join the union whether they wanted to or not. Another person replied by asking, "How else do you expect we can achieve uniformity of standards in the schools?"

Still another of the young people said that last year's housing bill includes a whole raft of programs, including new ways to make public property out of private property, and plans to extend urban renewal projects beyond blighted neighborhoods into adjoining areas.

"This is wonderful," shouted one bright-eyed young man excitedly. "Do you realize what this all means? It means that city people will now become victims of Federal aid. And when there are enough of these city victims they will begin to move back to the farm."

"Roger has come up with another of his tremendous insights into life," a blonde college girl said. "What the Government is really trying to do is reverse the migration of farm people to the cities; get people out of the crowded urban areas and back to the peaceful farm country."

"There certainly is more to this Government business than most people realize," said another young man. "They really know what they're doing. It just doesn't seem that way at first."

VICTIMS OF FARM ASSISTANCE

After hearing that refreshing conversation I came across an item in the Christian Science Monitor of January 20, which relates further to this matter of victimizing our farm people. It follows here:

DISPATCH FROM THE FARM: POLITICAL PIFFLE

(By John Gould)

LISBON FALLS, MAINE.—It's getting so you can't simply dislike anybody any more, but must line up a gang and have a demonstration. I heard a city politician say the other night it is high time to stop spending all this money on the farmers and begin helping the cities—the gravy train has been bogged down in the puckerbrush too long. This setting of class against class is now our great national way, and when urban renewal and the farm policy come to two falls out of three it will be the high point in our culture.

It is easy to quote Marcus Aurelius, or to point out that a Government loan to put up a silo in Hartland Four Corners, Vt., can be projected to 1,000 families in Somerville, Mass. Fifth Avenue, New York, has the lowest average yield per acre in the Nation. But in the passion of political piffle, which now fools all of the people all of the time, such use of gray matter is unfriendly to the Republic, and establishing the megalopolis as a have-not ought to be good for three consecutive terms.

After a couple of generations of farm aid, I think many farmers will be glad to see the cities get some of the assistance. In surveys alone, the amount of money available is astronomic, and some day there may even be money to do something after the survey is completed.

We folks out in the country have never known just how to cope with all this. Maybe the superior intellects of the urban areas can figure something out. Four times a year, for instance, I am surveyed at great expense by the Department of Agriculture. Our submarginal Maine farm is incorporated into the national statistics as regards cotton, tobacco, sorghum, and peanuts. Under a similar appropriation, dedicated to city uses, Boston would be surveyed on the Mardi Gras; Hartford about its subway system; Memphis about the Chicago Cubs; and Denver about its tidal estuaries.

The cities will discover that Federal aid is not always unbridled joy. One of my neighbors ran a milk route, and one day years ago a Government man came to see him and said, "How many quarts of milk a day do you sell" My neighbor told him, "Give or take a few, about 125 quarts."

So the Government began to lavish a subsidy on him, and for some time he got regular checks based on 125 quarts a day. This is roughly equivalent, teeter for totter, to taking down the elevated in Charlestown, and my friend couldn't wait for election day so he could rush in and vote for the administration two or three times.

But one day another Government man came around, and he found that my neighbor, although he was selling 125 quarts a day, was only producing about half of it, and was buying the rest from another farmer. This constituted a violation under Code Umpty-doo, fraud against the U.S. Government, and it took 7 minutes for the lawyers prosecuting him to pass a given point. Most of us expected him to be shot at sunrise, but some felt it would be life in Alcatraz. The judge, however, was a human being (he has since been replaced) and he thought the Government had overexercised. He hove the thing out.

The Government lawyers were pretty mad, and spoke about an appeal to the Supreme Court, and my neighbor didn't get any more subsidy on either his own milk or that of contributory accomplices. He later sold out and now operates an elevator in one of our more depressed cities, where he says he ups and downs are about the same, but he misses the fresh air. He is an out-and-out victim of farm assistance. Maybe when city assistance gets rolling a few victims may move out into the country and keep cows.

I would say about 125 percent of the farm subsidy runs to salaries. Long after activating funds are exhausted the field crew and the office staff continue their great efficiency. You have no idea how much help this is. I take notice that in Boston the first facelifting in 350 years is the erection of a new Government complex. Makes sense. I am sure they will include a fish pond. Here in Maine a great many fine rural improvement projects turn out to be fish ponds. And one of our brightest events is the annual pageant to select Miss St. Francis River Valley Soil Conservation and Water Resources Management. She is always very pretty.

I prognosticate that it won't make too much difference. Federal spending in the cities will be about the same as Federal spending in the boondocks and puckerbrush. I hope I can hear about it when Springfield, South Bend, and Salt Lake City encounter the lime routine. The Government paid for lime on condition the farmers spread it before a certain date in the fall. One year it was so dry it was foolish to spread it until we had a rain, and the next year it was so wet they couldn't get on their land to spread it at all. Everybody in the lime program was a criminal, facing a $10,000 fine and 10 years in prison. For my part, I never signed up for any of it, and I have never had a penny of Federal farm aid. You good city people can have my share.

Recognition of Brumidi Long Overdue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on the Library to procure a marble bust of Constantino Brumidi, for placement in the U.S. Capitol. Many of our colleagues have introduced similar legislation.

Evidence of Brumidi's genius is found everywhere in the Capitol. Thousands of visitors from every State of the Union and many overseas countries have viewed with admiration his artistic achievements.

Brumidi began his work in the Capitol in 1855 and for 25 years worked devotedly with all his strength and talent. His stirring murals, his colorful and expertly executed paintings, bronze stair rails, and bold and moving frescoes can be found in the corridors, in the committee rooms, and in the rotunda. While trying to finish the frieze in the rotunda, Brumidi died tragically as a result of a fall at the age of 75. He lay buried in an unmarked grave in Glenwood Cemetery for more than 50 years. Then, in the 1930's, Mrs. Myrtle Cheney Murdock, wife of our former colleague, Congressman Murdock, of Arizona, took a great interest in Brumidi and began gathering information about him. It was largely through her efforts that a bronze marker was finally provided in 1950 by the Congress for the Brumidi grave. No other tangible recognition of this great artist's contributions can be found in Washington today.

It is entirely fitting and appropriate for the Congress to demonstrate our Nation's gratitude to this great man who took such pride in his adopted country that he signed all his works simply, "C. Brumidi, Artist, Citizen of the United States."

Taxes and Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that Americans who object to restoring excise taxes on automobiles and telephone service are unpatriotic is most assuredly a misguided one.

The following editorial from Chicago's American of January 15, 1966, discusses this matter:

TAXES AND PATRIOTISM

President Johnson has added a curious postscript to the tax proposals made in his state of the Union address Wednesday night. At a press conference Thursday, he was asked about congressional criticism of his plan to restore excise taxes on telephone service and new automobiles—taxes that were dropped only 2 weeks ago—rather than cut back domestic spending.

The President's reply ran, in part: "I think most of the people are patriotic and I would expect in the light of our economy that, if we are going to have substantial increased expenditures in Vietnam * * * the Congress and the people would be willing to forego the repeal of the excise tax on long-distance telephone calls and new automobiles. * * *"

If these comments really reflect Johnson's views, they strike us as disturbing for two reasons. One is that the word "patriotic," as he uses it, seems to mean "willing to pay more taxes without complaint"; the corollary, we guess, is that people who object to the administration's tax plans are unpatriotic.

Another cause for uneasiness is that Johnson seems to be using Vietnam as a handy way of choking off criticism of his tax policies. The gist of his statement seems to be that the excise taxes are needed for the war effort, and anyone who opposes them is somehow undermining us in southeast Asia.

This gimmick, if it is one, is highly unconvincing. Johnson himself is plainly unwilling to divert one dime of his domestic spending programs to fighting the war; any sacrifices will come from the taxpayer, not from the Great Society planners. And those who complain about these sacrifices risk the charge of lacking patriotism.

We do not think the President is consciously adopting any such approach. But if his words are a clue to this thought processes, that's worrisome enough. When the Chief Executive starts feeling that it's unpatriotic to oppose his wishes, we start feeling a distinct chill.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to a topic which is of deep concern to me. On January 22, Americans of Ukrainian descent in my State celebrated the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On January 22, 1918, the Ukrainians proclaimed their independence at the ancient city of Kiev. Within 3 years Ukrainian independence had been crushed by the heavy hand of Soviet tyranny, but the spirit which inspired the patriots of 1918 lives on in the hearts of the Ukrainian people. They have not forgotten their brief taste of freedom.

Today I should like to discuss a very early period of Ukrainian history. From the 9th to the 13th century the Ukraine was an outpost of Byzantine civilization. The Ukrainian people's pride in this period has contributed to their sense of national identity and was one of the factors which has enabled them to maintain their independent spirit through centuries of foreign domination. Herodotus described in detail the early history of what is now the Ukraine, and Byzantine historians traced the history of the various invading tribes. In the ninth century a strong figure organized the separate clans into a strong state, with its capital at Kiev. By this time the people in this area were already speaking a Slavic language which has been described as ancient Ukrainian.

By the end of the 10th century the country had been converted to Christianity and had accepted the main outlines of Byzantine culture. At a time when most of Europe was engulfed in the Dark Ages, Kiev was a city of learning and enlightenment. Under Yaroslav the Wise, who ruled from 1036 to 1054, schools and libraries were established and scholars and artists were encouraged.

Yaroslav also established a code of laws. In form, it was patterned after the Byzantine law, but in content it summarized what Yaroslav considered to be the best rights and procedures which had been established by custom. With Byzantine help the great Cathedral of St. Sophia was constructed. Kiev became a meeting place for merchants from all over the civilized world. Despite Kiev's close ties to Byzantium, the Kievan rulers began to establish links with the rest of the world also. Dynastic ties, so important in those days, were made with England, France, and Norway.

The Kievan period is only a small part of the stirring history of the Ukrainians. The Ukrainian people have reason to be proud on their national independence day. We all fervently hope that the Ukrainians may someday regain their freedom.

Unpaid Tax Collectors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident thousands of small businessmen throughout the Nation will applaud the actions of a Waterloo, Iowa, man to call attention to the injustice of requiring American businessmen to spend countless hours as unpaid tax collectors for the Federal Government.

D. J. Spensley has presented a $3,000 bill to the District Director of Internal Revenue in Des Moines for services rendered. He contends that he has spent a minimum of 800 hours during the last 5 years in collecting money, keeping books, making reports, and assuming the responsibility of collecting social security and withholding Federal income taxes.

What particularly concerns him is the fact that, if he fails to perform the duties assigned to him by the Federal bureaucracy, he will be made to pay stiff penalties.

It is doubtful that Mr. Spensley will receive sympathetic consideration from the architects of the Great Society, but this does not make his cause any less just.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following articles and editorial which appeared in the Waterloo Daily Courier:

[From the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier]

ASKS PAY FOR COLLECTING TAXES—WATERLOO BUSINESSMAN TRIES TO BUCK SYSTEM

(By Harrison Weber)

DES MOINES.—A Waterloo businessman is trying to buck the system.

As an employer he objects to filling out forms and collecting money for social security and withholding of Federal income taxes.

D. J. Spensley, who operates Triangle Dry Cleaners, believes employers are entitled to remuneration for performing these services.

Although 62, Spensley is a man of action. He visited for over an hour with Ernest Bacon, district director of Internal Revenue for Iowa.

After explaining his position—that he is a forced unpaid collector for the Federal Government—Spensley informed Bacon that he feels justified in filing a claim against the Federal Government for these services.

ESTIMATES 838 HOURS

Spensley estimates that in the past 5 years he has spent 838 hours keeping books for the Federal Government to say nothing of the responsibility he assumes in performing this task.

During this period he has withheld $29,238.19 from the paychecks of his employees. Presently, he employs 21 people.

Spensley, who lives at 121 Elston Avenue, contends the Federal Governmnt hired him when it sent out tax forms and asked that they be completed and returned.

Bacon informed Spensley that since Congress has not allocated any funds for this express purpose, he would have to take the matter up with his superiors.

Spensley did not present a bill to Bacon because he did not know how much a rookie tax collector makes and he wanted to find out the hourly wage so that he could compute the bill. Spensley learned that the average hourly pay of a tax collector is about $3.75.

Bacon pointed out that Congress makes the laws and that he is merely carrying out these laws.

Spensley's reply to that was, "There is something greater than the law and that is justice."

URGES OTHERS TO FOLLOW

The Waterloo businessman, a lifelong Iowan, said he realized that one voice could not do much in changing the law. He suggested that other businessmen follow his example and file claims against the Federal Government for performing these services.

"This is a free country, but that doesn't mean that we must collect these moneys for the Government for free," he charged.

Spensley called this (collecting withholding and social security) discrimination against the employer.

HE'S FOUND A CAUSE

He points out that he is not in this for any publicity. In fact, he would prefer not to have any personal publicity. But D. J. Spensley, a very sincere man, has found, as he puts it, a cause.

But, he is only one man and he is bucking a big system.

[From the Waterloo Courier]

SAYS HE'LL DEDUCT WAGES—SPENSLEY PRESENTS HIS BILL AS TAX COLLECTOR

D. J. Spensley, Waterloo businessman, who has been carrying on a one-man campaign against working for the Federal Government for free, has presented District Internal Revenue Director Ernest W. Bacon, Des Moines, with a $3,000 bill for his services.

He contends that he has worked a minimum of 800 hours during the last 5 years in "collecting money, keeping books, making reports, and assuming the responsibility of collecting social security and withholding Federal income taxes."

Spensley arrived at the $3,000 total by computing his services at $3.75 an hour, which he says is about the average wage paid collectors for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

CITES POSSIBLE PENALTIES

He declared in a letter to Bacon that accompanied his statement that "at first the demands" made on his services by the Federal Government were reasonable and "did not require too much of my free time. But in the last 10 or more years it has become a great, increasing responsibility. I find I am being forced to perform all demands and if I fail to do so, I am penalized, charged interest and my personal assets are at stake, even as an officer of a corporation, and to date without compensation."

Spensley told Bacon that "by forcing me to perform this work for free my freedom is being restricted and I do not believe that the Department of Justice would knowingly allow this to happen to any citizen, and I respectfully request you refer this existing condition to the Department of Justice."

LABELS SELF COLLECTOR

He told Bacon that he (Spensley) has performed all the duties Bacon "has directed and demanded me to do, the same as any other employee or collector in your department, and therefore I must be an employee and entitled to wages for my time."

Spensley said that he would make it easy on the Government by deducting his "wages" from the money he is required to send the Government.

He suggested that this would be a "painless way" for the Government to pay.

Spensley further declared that "when the next appropriation is made, the only person on the appropriation committee that could object would be the one who has not accepted wages for his services" to the Government.

HAS LITTLE HOPE

He has little hopes of collecting the $3,000 from the Government.

Bacon said that "despite Spensley's strong feelings on the subject, he is not listed as a Government worker. We just don't have any money for that sort of thing."

He added, however, the request will be studied.

WOULD URGE OTHERS

Spensley says he didn't expect to win his battle right off the bat. His hope is to encourage other employers to do the same thing—demand pay for their Government bookkeeping every time they deposit withheld income taxes and social security funds.

Eventually, he said, Congress may feel the pressure and do something about it.

What really gripes him, he explains, are the penalties, fines, and bank account attachments threatened by the Government if he doesn't follow regulations.

He says the publicity about his crusade also makes him uncomfortable, but he feels it is the only way to enlist others in the battle.

[From the Waterloo Daily Courier]

GOVERNMENT USING UNPAID TAX COLLECTORS

Should American business be paid for acting as the major tax-collecting agency in the Nation?

D. J. Spensley, a Waterloo businessman, thinks so. In order to dramatize this belief, he went to Des Moines last week to present his bill for services as a tax collector to the district director of the Internal Revenue Service.

Spensley estimates that his business in 5 years spent 838 hours keeping books and filling out forms in connection with the Federal withholding and social security payroll deduction duties. If this were paid for at the going rate for tax collectors of $3.75 an hour, this small business with 21 current employees would have received $3,142.50 from the Federal Government.

The Waterloo businessman obviously has a reasonable argument. Why should one group of citizens, just because they engage in a particular type of vocation, be required to act as unpaid tax collectors for the whole Nation? This is patently unjust. It happens simply because this group of citizens numerically do not have enough votes to obtain consideration of their complaints.

Moreover, this system results in arguments for increasing Federal dominance in tax collection. One study reports that for every $100 collected in taxes the Federal Government pays only 44 cents for collection, the State governments average about $1, and the local government costs range from $5 to $10.

But the Federal Government is so "efficient" partly or even largely because it does not pay anything for such a large part of its collection services. It is true that the computerized payroll bookkeeping of the large corporation tends to minimize these collection expenses. But the small businessman is doubly handicapped because his records must be kept by hand.

In addition to Federal income tax withholding and social security deductions, the businessman in many States, including Iowa, must handle State income tax withholding and collection of the State and, in some cases, local sales taxes.

While keeping these records is a cost of doing business, it often cannot be passed on to the public in the form of higher prices because of intense competition. One unfortunate aspect of the enormous bookkeeping work required by the Government is to make it increasingly difficult to start a small business or for small business to survive.

We don't know if Spensley will get anywhere with his crusade; but he has a just cause.

Art Buchwald on the Medicare Disclaimer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, clearly the decision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to require of some applicants for health benefits under medicare a declaration of non-Communist affiliation has opened a most unappetizing can of worms.

Consider the case of Art Buchwald's Uncle Harry, suffering with rheumatism, yet worried about his eligibility for hospital care under medicare because of his membership in the Retired Friends of the Forest Hills Library.

Why should Uncle Harry be concerned? The requirement of the disclaimer is aimed at denying health benefits only to bad old people, not good old people, as Mr. Buchwald points out. This is indeed comforting to the good old people.

But maybe it would be even more comforting to all old people if we did not try to make this judgment of who are the good old people and who are the bad old people in providing medical care. With this in mind, I have introduced H.R. 11922 striking out the provisions on which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is requiring of the Uncle Harrys a disclaimer.

The full story of Uncle Harry, which appeared in Art Buchwald's column in the New York Herald Tribune on January 9, follows:

SUBVERSIVES FOR MEDICARE

(By Art Buchwald)

WASHINGTON.—One of the provisions of medicare is that any person not covered by social security or railroad retirement insurance is ineligible for hospital and nursing home benefits if he is a Communist or a member of a Communist front.

To enforce this, a person in this category must answer the following questions: "Are you now or have you during the past 12 months been a member of any organization which is required to register under the Internal Security Act of 1950 as a Communist-action organization, a Communist-front organization, or a Communist-infiltrated organization?"

I hadn't realized what chaos this question was causing until I got a call from my Uncle Harry, who was all excited about it.

"How are you, Uncle Harry?" I asked.

"My rheumatism is killing me. That's what I'm calling about. What is all this business about not being a member of the Communist Party or a Communist-infiltrated organization in order to get medicare?"

"It's quite simple, Uncle Harry. We don't want people who would overthrow our Government to get free hospital and nursing care."

"With my rheumatism I can't even get to the doctor, much less overthrow the Government."

"Ah, Uncle Harry, that's just it. If you were a Communist and you got hospital care, you might become well, and then you would be in a position to overthrow the Government."

"If I could get rid of my rheumatism, I'd be willing to join the John Birch Society."

"But, Uncle Harry, I don't know what you're all excited about. You're not a member of the Communist Party, are you?"

"I should hope not. Have you ever seen anyone with rheumatism who wanted to be part of a sit-in?"

"Then what are you worried about?"

"It's these Communist-front and Communist-infiltrated organizations. I don't know if I belong to any or not."

"Well, what organizations have you joined in the past 12 months?"

"The Bideaway Village for Senior Citizens, $10 down and $10 a month."

"I'm sure that's not on the subversive list."

"What about the Retired Friends of the Forest Hills Library?"

"That I'd better check. Anything else?"

"The Planned Parenthood Association?"

"That sounds bad, Uncle Harry. It's not on the list now, but you never can tell."

"I knew it," Uncle Harry said. "I'll never get my rheumatism cured."

"Now don't be discouraged, Uncle Harry. This law is only aimed at bad old people, not good old people. I'm sure they didn't have you in mind when they wrote it."

"At your age you can say that. If you want my opinion, I think the Government's trying to save some money."

"Uncle Harry, you don't seem to understand. The United States is out to eradicate the Communist Party. If their members don't get hospital care, they'll be eradicated that much sooner."

"Now that you explain it to me, it does make sense. I have only one problem."

"What's that?"

"With my rheumatism my hands shake so much I can't even answer 'No' to the question."

The Dangers of Leviathan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lawrence Fertig, a columnist for the San Francisco Chronicle, recently wrote a column entitled, "The Dangers of Leviathan," which certainly points out clearly and concisely the increasing difficulty resulting from the concentration of power in Washington.

His column follows:

THE DANGERS OF LEVIATHAN

(By Lawrence Fertig)

When administration officials first intervened to control prices for steel, aluminum, and copper the public seemed unconcerned despite some adverse comment in the press. Many people seemed to feel that officials in Washington are reasonable men who will use with restraint the power they arrogate to themselves.

When Congress passed the education bill which for the first time in American history started the Federal Government on the path of spending billions of dollars to subsidize primary and secondary education, Columnist Joseph Alsop reflected popular opinion when he said, "Education Commissioner Francis Keppel and Secretary of Education and Welfare John Gardner are going to use their leverage with care."

Ever-increasing economic and political control by Government officials has been condoned on the ground that this power will be used with care and restraint. But a number of recent actions by Washington officials have caused some soul searching by many who have gone along with this view. They now begin to fear the dangers of Leviathan, the all-powerful state. They have the uneasy feeling expressed by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis who was a leading liberal of his day. "Experience should teach us," he said, "to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. * * * The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

Good intentions in no way atone for arbitrary government action. The administration claims that it wants to curb inflation. The elementary fact is that only the government can cause inflation by its monetary and fiscal policies—by creating an excess of money and commercial bank credit, and by Federal overspending. If the Government curbed these policies there would be no need for price policemen.

Instead, however, administration officials, looking for a scapegoat, attack steel companies for raising prices on a mere 7 percent of their output. No law gives the administration this right, but its coercive power is so great that it can intimidate any industry.

Officials claim they are protecting the public interest. In this case the public interest is defined not by Congress but by the prejudices of administration officials.

In another instance, former Education Commissioner Keppel (he who was supposed to use his power with great restraint) withheld $30 million of school funds from Chicago. He wanted to penalize Chicago because it was not doing all it could to advance integration in public schools. Only intervention by President Johnson reversed the Commissioner's ruling.

However worthy any other objective may be, education of youngsters should be the sole objective of Federal education funds. Plainly when a Government agency has vast sums to distribute it can undercut education in behalf of any other objective it has in mind.

School superintendents in cities throughout the country have publicly expressed the fear—and with good reason—that Federal money and power will be used to dictate the curriculums and control the educational systems of communities throughout the country. Already Charles Cogan, president of the American Federation of Teachers, has urged Government "to set nationwide educational standards as the price for Federal aid to schools."

Another man of zeal (an official in the antipoverty program) recently presented a plan to use the leverage of Federal school subsidies to change their textbooks. He suggested that school texts should be revised to give a higher evaluation to the achievements of Negroes in American life. The proposal by a government agency to alter history to its liking has a frightening implication. It sounds like Orwell's "1984."

In still another area, Federal urban renewal officials are using their power and money to literally force some cities and towns (such as Berkeley Heights, N.J.) to condemn sections as "slum areas," although these cities and towns protest they are not slum areas. But it is hard to resist Federal money and Federal power.

Urban renewal destroyed 126,000 low-rent housing units in 12 years of operation while it created only 28,000 new homes. It uprooted many people from low-rent homes in established communities. They were forced out into higher-rent dwellings. Urban renewal removed from city tax rolls valuable assessable property which formerly yielded income to tax-hungry cities.

As the Federal Government assumes new and greater power over jobs, prices, housing, education, medical care—in fact, over all vital aspects of daily life—some doubt is arising in the minds of thoughtful modern liberals.

Speech by Secretary of Commerce John T. Connor, Before Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., January 24, 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce, at the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., on January 24, 1966.

The speech follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, JOHN T. CONNOR, AT THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT, DETROIT, MICH., JANUARY 24, 1966

The United States has many capitals. Washington is our political capital; New York City our financial capital; and Detroit is the capital of the automobile industry—an industry that epitomizes the bountiful efficiency and continuing progress of our free enterprise economy.

Right at the outset I want to say that Washingtonians are the first to admit that better automobiles can be made in Detroit than in Washington. So today in Detroit I plan to talk mostly about the automobile industry, and the far-reaching ramifications it has for all of us, whatever our pursuits.

The motor vehicle has done more than lift the ceiling on our economic statistics. It has revolutionized the style and quality of American life.

The very success of the industry has given rise to challenges which would not exist if Americans had not taken the automobile to heart so naturally and so completely. Its success, however, has also given you the strength and resources to meet these challenges. I would like to look at both sides of the coin with you, against the backdrop of a broader, national challenge which faces all of American business today.

In the first year of automobile production in this country, 65 years ago, the industry turned out a little more than 4,000 units, valued at about $5 million. Last year more than 11 million units were produced, with a value of $21 billion—an all time record. Those two sentences tell the greatest industrial success story of the century.

The auto industry has had an important and far-reaching effect on the pattern of employment throughout the entire Nation. More than three-quarters of a million businesses are based on the automobile. One out of every seven wage earners is dependent upon the industry in one way or another.

Of tremendous significance to all of us is the fact that the automobile industry is the largest single employer in the United States—with around 700,000 persons. Only government and wholesale and retail trade employ more people. Autos use up half of our petroleum output, three-fifths of the rubber, more than half the lead, more than one-fifth of the steel, one-third of the zinc, and about 15 percent of the aluminum, copper, and nickel.

But these facts and figures suggest only one aspect of the industry's contribution to our economic life.

The principles of factory efficiency developed in the auto industry have been widely copied in other areas. The assembly line was first placed in effective operation in the auto industry. The industry pioneered in developing intercompany technical standards, as well as cost control and management techniques. Decentralized operations and responsibilities—with coordinated control, now an accepted concept in business management, were pioneered within the motorcar industry.

Detroit has played an important role in upgrading the skills of our labor force. Today, the industry is making a contribution toward the solution of one of our major problems—the wider employment of Negroes at all levels—blue collar and white collar, as well as management.

The auto industry's place in our economy is dramatically illustrated by a major analytical tool recently put into use by the Commerce Department. This is input-output analysis, which enables us to measure the effects of a given level of output in one industry on all related industries.

The production of $1 billion worth of automobiles, for example, requires nearly $203 million from the iron and steel industry, $51 million from nonferrous metals, $48 million from the rubber industry, $16½ million from the glass and glass products industry, and more than $20 million from finance and insurance. And there are many other industries which similarly benefit from auto sales.

In the immediate future—1968 or 1969—America will be traveling 1 trillion vehicle miles a year, and we will be producing 12 million trucks and cars. The prospects are that this enormous output of motor vehicles will require 22 million tons of steel, 1,200,000 pounds of aluminum, 1 million bales of cotton, 1,600,000 tons of rubber. And we will be consuming more than 80 billion gallons of gasoline.

Motor transportation has a massive stimulating effect on all segments of economic activity. Our economy literally moves on wheels, the wheels of Detroit.

And this economic activity involves thousands of small entrepreneurs who supply parts, products, and services to be the manufacturers and the motoring public. Included within the automobile-based segment of the economy are more than 2,000 manufacturers of vehicles or equipment who employ less than 250 workers. There are almost 50,000 individuals repair shops with less than 8 employees, more than 100,000 service stations with less than 4 workers. So the economic benefits of motor transportation are widely dispersed throughout the country.

But what does the far future hold for the auto industry? The number of licensed drivers is expected to double by the year 2000. Automobile production will almost have to double between now and then even if we only maintain the present ratio of automobiles to licensed drivers. But we will probably better this record. Increases in per capita income and in population, brighten the future of the industry. We estimate that annual production will have to reach 20 million passenger cars to meet the demands of the year 2000.

The motor vehicle industry also has a great potential for growth in the developing countries. Transportation facilities are a necessary prerequisite for the achievement of even the first steps of economic development. Without transportation, little can be done to bring land into production, build industries, provide necessary channels between factory, farm, and markets, and translate the wealth of forests and mines from potential into reality.

We estimate that in Latin America per capita GNP will more than double by the year 2000. Population there is expected nearly to triple. These gains may mean registrations of about 26 million cars by the end of this century, compared with the current level of 3 million cars.

The prominent international position of the auto industry gives it a key role in President Johnson's voluntary program to improve the balance of payments. The postwar years have witnessed an extraordinary expansion in the foreign operations of your industry. The basic pattern has been the creation of major manufacturing facilities abroad rather than any substantial expansion of exports from the United States. Taking the American transportation equipment industry as a whole, the book value of foreign affiliates increased from about half a billion dollars in 1950 to almost $3½ billion in 1964. There were correspondingly large increases in the earnings of these affiliates and in their remitted profits.

I am very pleased to be able to report that the auto manufacturers rank with the top performers among participants in the 1965 balance-of-payments program. From recently submitted estimates, it appears that the auto firms registered an improvement in 1965 of more than 20 percent over their 1964 contributions to the U.S. balance of payments. This is more than twice the percentage improvement expected for all of the participating companies collectively.

In fact, preliminary data indicate that the auto companies contributed about one-fourth of the total improvement of $1.3 billion expected under the 1965 voluntary program. This was a response to our country's need of which the automobile industry can be deservedly proud. The overall increase in contributions by the motor vehicle companies was accomplished mainly through increased exports and through reductions in capital outflows. The major firms made sizable increases in their foreign borrowings so as to carry out foreign investment schedules while restricting the outflow of U.S. funds.

Our efforts to improve the balance of payments naturally led us to examine closely our export position and to strive for ways in which exports can be expanded. The motor vehicle industry has managed to expand exports in the face of more than a normal amount of difficulties. Its products must contend not only with all of the common hinderances to foreign trade and operations but they must cope, in addition, with others specifically aimed at that industry. Sales of American automobiles abroad have long been inhibited by internal taxes of various forms that effectively discriminate against the U.S.-built car. Customs duties many times larger than the U.S. duty are a major deterrent to our exports. The Common Market countries and the United Kingdom have a duty rate of

22 percent compared to the U.S. import duty of only 6½ percent.

These factors create a sharp difference between the retail price of a U.S. car in this country and the price tag it carries in foreign markets. For example, one particular car with standard equipment has a suggested retail price in the United States of just under $3,000. This same car has a list price of over $7,000 in France, over $6,000 in Austria, over $5,000 in Belgium, over $6,000 in Italy. Obviously, the inflation of medium-priced American cars to such high values in other countries is a severe deterrent to exports of these cars.

Despite these difficulties, however, exports by the industry increased $300 million between 1957 and 1964. However, the inhibiting effect of the barriers, and the incentives these barriers provide for production overseas, can be seen by the remarkable performance of sales from foreign production facilities. During the same period, sales from foreign plants increased more than 10 times as much as exports.

We in Government are constantly pressing for removal of unjustified import restrictions and for equitable tax treatment where discrimination against U.S. products is involved. In the Kennedy round negotiations, we are seeking tariff concessions on automobiles. We are also seeking more equitable tax treatment in the application of road taxes of certain European countries.

We are pressing the Japanese to modify the commodity tax on automobiles, which amounts to 40 percent of most U.S. vehicles and either 20 or 30 percent on most other nations' vehicles.

A major recent accomplishment in the ground rules governing international trade was the recently enacted Canadian-American agreement which provides for free trade in original motor vehicle equipment between the two countries. This agreement promises to benefit both countries significantly and is a milestone on the road toward freer trade between Canada and the United States.

What we see then, as we survey the automobile industry in modern America, is a dynamic center of strength in our economy, based on a technological invention that has had widespread social, cultural, educational, political, and many other consequences in the lives of every citizen. America literally drove into a position of world leadership during the 20th century on the wheels of the motor vehicle.

America has become a motorised Nation. We have taken automobile products into every corner of the country, into every facet of our lives. We have become dependent upon automobiles for the essentials of life, as well as for the pleasures and diversions of life. Our economic growth is inextricably linked with the healthy growth of the automobile industry. The integration of cars into our daily lives, however, because it has been so widespread, has been accompanied by some problems and challenges which are now attracting national attention.

Highway safety, the beauty of our countryside, a clean environment, the role of private cars in urban transportation, these subjects are on the current agenda of social observers, economists, government and professional leaders, and a host of other groups who are concerned about the nature and direction of national life. All too often, the automobile is seen as the one and only cause of many of our problems. This is a gross oversimplification.

But the automobile does play a part in these problems, and the automobile industry has a responsibility to help meet the challenges posed by these problems. Fortunately, the intellectual and material resources which have brought the industry to a position of great prominence in national life will serve it well as it prepares to meet these challenges.

We have come a long way, in highway safety, from the situation that existed decades ago. Mile for mile, the fatality rate for highway travel in this country is half the rate of Western Europe and one-fourth the rate of Japan. We take no comfort from these statistics, however, and we are determined to do better in the future.

There are a number of actions at the Federal level of Government which reflect mounting national concern with the problem of highway safety. Beginning in 1968, for example, each state will be required to have a highway safety program which meets uniform Federal standards.

Two years ago, President Johnson spurred a special effort to eliminate danger traps along older Federal-aid highways. The State of Virginia, to cite just one example, reduced accidents 66 percent under this spot improvement program. So we know that many lives and much loss can be saved by engineering.

The Interstate Highway System itself represents a significant advance in the area of highway safety. The fatality rate on the Interstate System is 2.5 per 100 million vehicles miles, compared with a rate of 9.7 on other roads, truly a remarkable example of what can be achieved.

As you know, there has been a great stir of interest and action on highway safety by both Houses of Congress in the past year and this activity will no doubt accelerate during the coming session, highlighted by President Johnson's proposed Highway Safety Act of 1966.

One of the most encouraging developments, in my view, is the recent announcement by the University of Michigan that a highway safety research institute will be established, supported by the automobile industry. The significance of this announcement arises, not so much from the substantial amount of funds involved, nor from the research program which will be carried out, but rather as one more dramatic example of a responsible industry helping to meet the challenge of highway safety. And the special public information program initiated recently on all phases of automobile driving safety by a leading automobile manufacturer certainly deserves a special word of commendation.

In the field of landscape beauty, Government has responded with the Highway Beautification Act, controlling billboards and junkyards along highways that benefit from Federal aid. I note, with satisfaction, that one of the leaders in the automobile industry has decided to buy the equivalent of a quarter of a million junked cars each year, in the form of fragmatized steel. Here is a combination of public service and technological ingenuity at its very best.

Maintaining a clean environment is becoming an increasingly difficult problem in our urban and highly industrialized society. There are may causes of air pollution. There are many essential requirements in modern life, however, where we have had to balance a certain level of pollution against other social objectives and needs.

It has been gratifying to me to note that industry's voluntary efforts to solve the air pollution problem, with respect to motor vehicles, have predated the issuance of Federal regulations in this area.

Finally, the role of the individual automobile in our total transportation picture has come under close and sometimes critical scrutiny in recent months. The automobile is attacked, defended, and interpreted in terms of land use, economics, city planning, cost-benefits, mass transit, and even Freudian psychology.

I don't pretend to be an expert in any of those areas, but one thing is clear—transportation in this country will increasingly be approached from a total systems point of view. This trend is clearly reflected in President Johnson's announced intention to create a Cabinet level Department of Transportation. Thus, more than ever, the automobile industry has a responsibility to help define the role of private motor vehicles in the national transportation picture.

All of the challenges I have mentioned call for resolute programs of action by our most important industry. But there is an additional element which must not be ignored. To the extent that the automobile industry exercises responsible leadership in matters of public concern, there will be correspondingly less pressure for governmental action. The judgment, in matters such as these, is ultimately based on public confidence—confidence among the general public that the industry is acting in a responsible manner.

So I would encourage those of you interested in this industry, as you shoulder your public service responsibilities, to make your story known. In this less than perfect world, it is not enough merely to do the right thing. People must know that you are doing the right thing. A solid bond of confidence between the public and the automobile industry would help provide the foundation to solve every problem I have mentioned today.

It is important to recognize that in our complex, interdependent society, business shares mutual interests not only with the public, but also with Government. Every Government activity, every Government program depends for its support on the strength and vitality of the economy. This situation requires a spirit of close cooperation between the two parties.

Recognizing this fact, business and Government in recent years have demonstrated genuine effort and good faith in making this partnership work. And the record of the past 5 years proves beyond doubt that the partnership has worked for the benefit of everyone: business, labor, Government, and the general public.

Five years ago the Nation was in the depths of a recession. Gross national product was about $500 billion. Corporate profits were $45 billion. Personal income was about $400 billion. Five and one-half million Americans were out of work.

Today, we are in the 59th month of uninterrupted economic growth. Gross national product last year was more than $675 billion. Corporate profits were more than $73 billion. Personal income was over $530 billion. Unemployment was down to less than 2.9 million. Eight million new jobs have been added to the economy in the 5-year period. And 1966 looks just as good.

I might point out that during this same period, the auto industry put together 4 consecutive good years, a feat never before accomplished.

What happened to cause this dramatic upturn in the economic life of the Nation? There is no single simple explanation. An increasingly skilled labor force was a factor. So were the vitality and initiative of business management. Government did its part, through sound fiscal and monetary policies. Put these things all together and they spell cooperation. In fact the cooperation has worked so well that our problem today is not how to get the economy out of a recession, but how to handle unparalleled growth and record prosperity with wisdom and finesse.

The natural pressures generated in any expanding economy have been complicated, in our case, by the greatly increased military requirements arising from the situation in Vietnam. The gap between our potential output and our actual output has been narrowing in recent months. As the gap narrows, the challenge facing us is: Can we maintain a balanced prosperity? There is no question about our ability to produce all the goods and services the Nation requires. The problem is to do this without disruptions caused by labor and material shortages, and to do the job without inflationary pressures on wages and prices.

In my view, we can meet these challenges. We can; that is, if business, labor, and Government continue to work together. The competing and sometimes conflicting demands of all groups in our society, at a time such as this, ultimately come into focus at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington, D.C. What does the situation look like from the White House? Put yourselves, for a moment, in the place of the man who occupies that seat, President Lyndon B. Johnson.

What are the alternative courses of action he sees when prices and wages threaten to escalate to inflationary levels?

Should we fall back on laissez-faire economic theory? Should we let an expanding economy and growing military requirements simply collide? Should we accept the inevitable inflation which would follow? This course is out of the question, for it would wipe out many of the social and economic gains of the past 5 years and impose intolerable burdens on our older citizens and others of fixed income who can least afford the consequences of inflation.

Or should we consider some form of legislative controls over wages and prices? Controls which would be centrally administered, by people far removed from the complicated workings of supply and demand in the marketplace? The President doesn't want this. The public doesn't want this. Labor doesn't want this. And business doesn't want this.

Finally, should we seek some middle course, a course based not on legislation and compulsion, but on good faith and cooperation? Given the alternatives, I see this as the only reasonable course of action. If we want to preserve the economic gains of the past 5 years, if we want to maintain our free world leadership, if we want to make good on our social and humanitarian obligations, then what we need is not less cooperation, but more cooperation and understanding between business and Government.

We need a course of action in which there is give and take on both sides, a course of action which recognizes that there are bound to be differences, but which also recognizes that good sense must, in the end, prevail.

On any mature basis of appraisal the forces that bind business and Government in common purpose are far stronger than the strains that tend to divide us.

We need statesmen in business no less than we need statesmen in Government. We need to recognize that these are exceptional times, and exceptional times call for exceptional acts of sacrifice and understanding, based on confidence and good will and concern for the public interest.

The continued maintenance of wage-price stability is a challenging task. But as the business and banking communities demonstrated by their magnificent response to the balance-of-payments problem, a challenge of this type can be successfully met if there is understanding and cooperation on all sides.

In saying this, I recognize that countering inflationary pressures is, in some ways, more difficult than most other tasks. In the balance-of-payments situation, for example, nearly all the variables are subject to management actions by corporation executives. Cost-price levels, on the other hand, frequently involve factors which are beyond the direct control of the average businessman.

We hope, and we expect, that in 1966 the American economy will rise to record heights of achievement. We also hope, and we expect, that in 1966 American business will rise to new heights of public service, to new levels of cooperation with Government in the public interest, so that we may meet all of our goals and commitments, both at home and abroad.

How Cooperative Extension Serves the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Record a progress report of the Cooperative Extension Service, a division of the College of Agriculture, University of Connecticut, located in my district. The report covers the year 1965 and describes the accomplishments and services to the people of the Second Congressional District of Connecticut.

For over a half century the extension service, as a part of the land-grant university, has helped the people of eastern Connecticut with their goals of social and economic development. Over the years, the program has expanded greatly in scope and in the number of people served, so that during the past year over 200,000 men, women, and youth were aided in various ways as described in the report. This unique arrangement of informal education has proven successful in the application of modern technology which is essential to the continued growth and development of Connecticut.

The report was prepared under the direction of W. B. Young, dean of the College of Agriculture and director of the extension service, and H. M. Hansen, associate director of the extension service. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues who believe in helping people to help themselves through education. I am indeed very proud of the achievements attained by this extension service, and particularly for the people of my district.

The report reads as follows:

PROGRESS REPORT: COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVES THE PEOPLE OF CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT NO. 2

(By H. M. Hansen, associate director of extension, College of Agriculture, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.)

Congressional District No. 2 in Connecticut is served by the cooperative extension service, a division of the College of Agriculture, at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. The service operates county extension centers at Norwich, Rockville, Brooklyn, and Haddam where specialists and agents conduct educational programs in agriculture, home economics, 4-H youth work and community development. They are aimed at helping both rural and urban people improve their farms, homes, businesses, and communities.

During the last 12 months the local extension program, dedicated to educative action through the application of research, directly assisted 217,279 men, women, and youth in individual and group conferences and meetings. These individuals received or requested information on production and marketing of agricultural products; farm and home business management; insect and disease control; foods and nutrition; health and family living; safety; civil defense; consumer education; clothing construction and selection; home and community beautification; home furnishings and equipment; community development; and public affairs. In addition, extension personnel (many hold advanced degrees in their specialty fields) reached many of the approximately 500,000 people in this district with 121,611 publications, newspaper articles, radio and television programs and circular letters.

Following is a sampling of the types of programs conducted by the extension staff, with the support of trained and dedicated volunteer local leaders. The latter help to determine the content of these activities, thereby tailoring them to meet the needs and to solve the socioeconomic problems of people throughout the district.

Economic Opportunity Act aids community development: The provisions of this act provided extension an additional means to further assist communities with programs for orderly growth and development. Specialists and agents spent much time conducting discussions and meetings on the purposes of this act with local leaders and resource people in 10 towns, commonly referred to as the Quinebaug Valley. This so-called town grouping is located in the northeastern section of the district. Extension assisted in the establishment of a Quinebaug Valley Action Committee (QVAC). The group has prepared a regional development plan and applied for a grant for its antipoverty work.

With extension's assistance, QVAC has several projects underway or in the planning stage. Program Head Start provides preschoolers from culturally deprived families with happy educational experiences to better prepare them for school life.

Another project, Handup, encourages potential high school dropouts to stay in school and at the same time give them some income and job training in forestry and conservation practices. Other activities include the establishment of a Neighborhood Youth Corps for underprivileged youths to perform tree planting projects; remedial classes for the poorly educated and unemployed so that they can better prepare themselves for future employment; and instructions on improved use of surplus foods and available money for low income families.

In another activity, extension assisted the Quinebaug's Valley Mental Health and Welfare Council in involving other resource persons in its planning activities. For example, the local agricultural agent brought to the council's attention the ihgh rate of alcoholism among farm laborers in the area. He explained that many poultry farmers were willing to hire these people if they were rehabilitated. Consequently, the council has applied for a grant to set up a halfway house to help those mentally disturbed people make the necessary socio-economic adjustments for eventual employment. Meantime, extension's community organization development specialist assisted the council in collecting, analyzing and interpreting data on the status of mental health illness within the area. He helped them develop action programs aimed at intelligent solutions of this critical problem.

Open spaces promote wise use of natural resources: The extension staff has been very active in providing educational assistance to communities interested in participating in the Connecticut open spaces program. They met with numerous groups concerned with the establishment of town conservation commissions, planning agencies and individuals who desired to preserve land for recreation, conservation and other open space use.

An outstanding example of extension's role in educating citizens on the intent of this program, enacted into law by the 1963 general assembly, was its work in the town of Durham. Here the service brought together other public and private agencies to explain the need and long-term benefits of managing wisely the community's natural resources. Subsequently, the town established a conservation commission whose members developed a comprehensive open space plan that will benefit present and future generations. Basically, it consists of acquiring lands, using town, State, and Federal moneys, to assure a nonpolluted source of water for home and industrial use as well as to provide areas for family picnicking, fishing, hunting and other recreational potential. As a first step in implementing this plan, Durham's Conservation Commission proposed and won approval of local residents voting in referendum to buy a 100-acre farm. Purchases such as this one point to extension's successful efforts in educating the citizenry on the crucial need for effective open space planning. In effect, it has set the stage for other towns and cities performing or planning similar programs of preserving the beauty and natural resource of the Connecticut countryside.

Regionalization leads to improved service: Commercial agricultural and resource development people are now being served through a recent realinement of extension work beyond the county lines. Agents who had been serving one country now serve a single producer group in a multicounty area. Some State specialists also now work directly with farmers and related groups. The moves were made to release county staff time to work directly with problems of resource development affecting communities and to better serve farmers ad others with highly technical information. This approach, first implemented in Middlesex and New Haven Counties, is now being expanded to involve agents in all counties of the Constitution State.

Building aids for poultrymen: Agricultural engineers and agents provided plans and educational assistance to poultrymen in remodeling and expanding their operations. Some 300 producers attended two meetings on housing aimed at helping them become more efficient and competitive in the poultry busines. Already 100,000 square feet of Connecticut panel poultry houses are under construction, representing the largest poultry building boom in eastern Connecticut since the 1950's. The 4 counties in this district, incidentally, continue to rank within the 100 leading counties in the United States in the production of poultry meat and chicken eggs. Keeping this agricultural industry technically alert means the continuation of thousands of jobs for area people.

Dairy farmers learn to cope with the agricultural drought: Farmers during these past 2 summers have been hard pressed to grow adequate crops for livestock and home use because of very low rainfall. Extension advised dairy farmers on what substitutes to use to formulate balanced rations for animal feeding programs. They also worked with dairy, vegetable, and fruitgrowers on determining actual water needs for livestock and crops.

Safety stressed with agricultural chemicals: Safe and effective use of agricultural chemicals were strongly emphasized in the production of agricultural products, home lawn and garden care and preservation of wildlife. The service in Middlesex County participated in an intensive educational campaign to inform the public about a massive outbreak of gypsy moths and the necessity for control. This insect since 1960 has infested more than 58,000 acres of woodland, defoliating thousands of trees and killing many of them. Extension assisted Government officials in several towns to appraise this situation and to attain suppression through aerial spraying.

Consumer education helps homemakers in many ways: Thousands of homemakers received information on better management of family resources through programs in consumer education. Windham and Tolland Counties conducted a special series for home and farm owners or buyers on "Selection of Housing." They studied house planning, remodeling, construction details, utilities, and septic tanks, financial matters, and home grounds beautification. Comments about this activity ranged from "I got some help on how to better coordinate my farm building with the outside living area" to "I know now what to look for when buying a home."

Another major extension program, nutrition education, aims to maintain and to improve the health and fitness of local families. A series of three 2-hour classes in the morning and repeated in the evening attracted 55 homemakers in one county. In addition, Extension provides instruction in this subject and other home economics fields to 171 homemaker study groups whose membership totals 3,000.

The 4-H prepares youth for adult responsibility: Youth, the district's greatest resource, is served through Extension 4-H Club program. Originally centered in rural areas, the program now attracts many members of suburban and urban areas as well. District membership now totals 3,916 boys and girls, ages 9 to 19, and 435 volunteer local adult leaders. The latter assist Extension club agents and specialists in preparing these youths for successful adult living in a changing world. Club activities stress development of citizenship, leadership, responsibility, self-confidence, cooperation and quality workmanship, along with the learning of scientific principles in over 50 fields. Among the more popular are poultry and dairy, automotive safety, clothing, foods and nutrition.

Summer camping is another favorite activity. More than 1,000 members attend at least 1 week of 4-H camp at the three sites in this district. Their parents and other individuals and groups have donated some $200,000 to support these popular camping programs. They provide the youngsters an enriched experience of outdoor living, playing, and working together. Recently, the Middlesex County 4-H camp committee had a bond-burning ceremony to highlight the raising of $58,700 for the purchase of their campsite. In this work, no Government funds are used for operating and maintaining these camp facilities. They are run and financed solely by public-spirited men and women and groups, in cooperation with extension, on behalf of youth.

Other significant 4-H programs, include countrywide fairs, career exploration tours, and work with the handicapped and mentally retarded. A new pilot project, one of three in the country, will soon feature training meetings for 4-H'ers on emergency preparedness in Tolland County and also Windham County. Participants will learn how a community can prepare itself to meet any kind of emergency or disaster.

Agricultural centers receive strong support: Over the years the people in Congressional District No. 2 have provided strong financial support and the leadership necessary to conduct Extension's educational programs. More recently, thousands donated about half of the $450,000 to buy, build, and maintain the four agricultural centers housing the Extension staffs. Moreover, the Extension Service was instrumental in providing office space and facilities to house all agricultural agencies in these centers. It now offers one-stop educational service and technical assistance to farmers and other groups. Such strong support as seen here makes Extension's efforts to help people help themselves more vital than ever.

Why Adam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, a bill to require Senate confirmation of a new Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation when J. Edgar Hoover eventually retires has been passed by the Senate and is now pending before the House. I would like to urge quick passage of this measure by this body.

There is no reason to believe that the universally respected and admired Mr. Hoover will not be active for a long time. We all want him to continue his activities as long as he is able to. However, there are dangers if we do not act on this bill soon.

Most of us are probably unaware that Adam Yarmolinsky, who was prevented by Members of this body from becoming Deputy Director of the poverty program, was named to a top security post in the Pentagon. It is interesting to note that Yarmolinsky was appointed to this $26,000 a year post by the Secretary of Defense only 2 days after the first session of this Congress adjourned. There is speculation that Mr. Yarmolinsky is being prepared to take over the FBI when Hoover leaves. I for one would like to see Senate confirmation of this vital position required.

The Washington Observer, a Washington newsletter, recently published an article on this subject. I am placing this article in the RECORD at this time.

WHY ADAM?

As the new year begins Washington insiders are wondering about the unfolding situation in the Department of Justice. Seventy-year-old J. Edgar Hoover, the FBI Director, will soon step down and already the political wolves are howling with glee.

For Mr. Hoover has indeed been a credit to his calling. He first entered the Department of Justice in 1917 and later served as a special assistant to the Attorney General. He then was assistant FBI Director from 1921 to 1924, and in 1924 was appointed Director. Although the FBI itself had been in existence some 16 years at the time of his appointment, Mr. Hoover's great leadership ability and personal mystique have left an indelible imprint upon the office of Director. In effect, Mr. Hoover and the office are now one and the same and so far this has been a boon for all law enforcement in America.

The true measure of Mr. Hoover's long reign however must be left for history to judge because, without question, he has been subjected, especialy since President Kennedy took office 5 years ago, to increasing pressures from above to abuse his trust. That he has by and large held firm against these pressures is a compliment to his noble character and great determination.

But all good things must come to an end. As Mr. Hoover rapidly approaches the age of retirement a struggle is developing within the administration to name his successor.

Only 2 days after the 89th Congress adjourned, one Adam Yarmolinsky was appointed by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara to the top security post in the Pentagon; that of Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, at an annual salary of $26,000. This post does not require Senate confirmation and carries a title permitting Yarmolinsky to later claim "security" experience for the top FBI position.

That Yarmolinsky, who wrote a slanted book for the Ford Foundation-sponsored Fund for the Republic against Federal security procedures, should be named to a ranking Defense security job shows how far the wheel has turned. Not a public word was said against this appointment despite the Yarmolinsky record.

The truth is that the public believed Yarmolinsky had been eased out of the Federal Government after an influential group of responsible Congressmen refused to vote for L.B.J.'s multibillion-dollar poverty program if Yarmolinsky assumed the post of Deputy Director, to which he had been appointed. Instead, this man, whom most Congressmen regard as a dangerous leftist, continued as special assistant to McNamara at $24,500 a year. He just laid low awhile until the 89th adjourned and McNamara, who has reached new heights of influence with the President, was able to promote him

Why is McNamara so solicitous for Yarmolinsky's future in the Government service? Why does he always go to bat for the hottest hot potato in Washington, even to the point of reversing his own security officer who refused to clear Yarmolinsky after reading the FBI report on him? One reason is because McNamara himself was brought to President Kennedy's attention as a potential Cabinet appointee largely through the efforts and influence of former Ford Fund for the Republic Big Shot Adam Yarmolinsky. Back in August 1960, Yarmolinsky joined the Kennedy for President committee as an assistant on a fee basis to Candidate Kennedy's brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver. Yarmolinsky's job was that of screening personnel and finding prospective high-ranking Government appointees for the Kennedy administration. In addition to McNamara, Yarmolinsky picked Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance as well as some 75 lawyers, largely extreme leftwingers, who are now spotted in key decisionmaking Federal jobs.

MOM AND DAD

Yarmolinksy's past record is a security officer's nightmare. Poor Adam had two strikes against him (from a security point of view) even before he was born; namely, his father, Avraham, and his mother, Babette. Both Papa and Mama Yarmolinksy are pro-Communist. In fact, A. F. Canwell, former chairman of the Washington State Joint Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities, has referred to Adam Yarmolinsky's parents as two top U.S. Communists. Father Avraham was actively affiliated with the Communist John Reed Clubs (named after one of the founders of the American Communist Party) of the United States, while Mother Babette wrote for the Communist publication Soviet Russia Today. Adam, of course, insists that his parents' political views have not influenced him; just as did Berkeley's "free speech movement" freewheeling beatchick, Bettina Aptheker (daughter of CP theoretician, Herbert Aptheker), right down to the day she found it expedient to announce her longstanding Communist Party membership in California.

Here follow a few of Yarmolinsky's more blatant activities:

(1) While at Harvard, he was head of the campus Marxist club; (2) he was a founding member and on the editorial staff of the campus Marxist magazine Yardling, which presented to students the viewpoint of the Young Communist League; (3) in 1941, while a student at Harvard, he attended the Communist-controlled American Youth Congress; (4) while at Harvard he also attended meetings of the Communist Youth League; (5) he solicited funds for the Spanish War Relief on behalf of the Young Communist League; (6) he said of the Young Communist League, "they believe, and I was inclined to believe, that the so-called Communist government was a desirable end."

After these earlier "experiences," Adam became active in more respectable leftist enterprises. He became secretary of the Ford Fund for the Republic and a lawyer and consultant to several other tax-exempt foundations. Curiously, it was soon after Yarmolinsky entered the Pentagon as a special assistant to the Secretary of Defense that agitation was started for the successful muzzling of the military, and a commissar type "civilian control" setup was imposed on our military leaders.

Clearly, there is much more involved in Yarmolinsky's amazing move into the Federal security field than simply the repayment of old political debts. There is a concerted, well-organized, powerful drive behind him. Even before McNamara acted, influential columnists Evans and Novak write an article for a national publication trying to clean up Yarmolinsky's Red record and claiming that he shouldn't be blamed for his parents' proclivity toward communism. Amazingly, the Observer has learned that, although Yarmolinsky's name has been prominently mentioned dozens of times in the Halls of Congress these last few years, the name "Yarmolinsky" is strangely absent from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD's permanent index for this period. Normally, every name mentioned in the RECORD is carefully indexed; but then Adam has always been shy when it comes to publicity. The Index Office of the Joint Committee on Printing is simply not that inefficient; somebody, somehow, must like Adam Yarmolinsky.

BIG AND BOLD

The radical left, as usual, thinks big and bold but neglects no detail in carrying out its projects. Their plan is simply this: if possible, take over complete control of the FBI and gradually turn it into a "special" or "parallel" secret police force to insure that the opposition is kept in its place; much the same as in Gaullist France.

Barring this, they intend at all costs to keep this important post out of the hands of anti-Communists; they don't intend to get stuck with another Hoover and the fact that this important job does not require Senate confirmation and consequent public debate gives them a golden opportunity.

How can they lose with Adam? Of course, Mr. Hoover and the Congress have yet to be heard from but when McNamara and company sit down to "reason" with L.B.J., even if Adam is knocked out of the picture, they will certainly have a veto over a hard anti-Communist candidate. But more on this later.

"Boy of the Year" Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, each year the Boys Clubs of America conduct a national "Boy of the Year" competition. Outstanding young men are chosen from communities around the country to compete.

Representing Greater Lowell, Mass., in this year's contest will be David Maskaluk, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Shanahan of 26 Lisa Lane in Lowell. Mr. Maskaluk is one of the most distinguished competitors for the award and I am sure will bring great credit to his community.

An article outlining David's achievements recently appeared in the Lowell Sun. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

LHS STUDENT IN NATIONAL "BOY OF THE YEAR" CONTEST

LOWELL.—A 17-year-old high school senior who has been nominated for appointment to the U.S. Air Force Academy, has been selected to represent Greater Lowell in the Boys Clubs' nationwide "Boy of the Year" contest.

David Maskaluk, son of Mr. and Mrs. John Shanahan of 36 Lisa Lane was selected "Boy of the Year" for the local Boys Club and was awarded a plaque by Mayor Edward J. Early during ceremonies at city hall yesterday.

His local selection puts Maskaluk in the race for the Boys Clubs of America's 20th annual Junior Citizens contest.

He will compete with nominees from Boys Clubs throughout the country for the $3,200 scholarship which is awarded yearly by a nationally distributed magazine.

Enrolled in the college preparatory course at Lowell high, Maskaluk is a captain in the boys regiment, member of the student council, was a guard on the LHS football team, and a member of the wrestling team.

Active in religious, civic, and fraternal affairs, Maskaluk is a member of St. Patrick's church, served as an altar boy and in CYO affairs of the parish.

Lowell's "boy of the year" served his community in Heart Fund, United Fund, and March of Dimes drives and as a volunteer worker in the city civil defense shelter-stocking program.

At the boys club he is a member of the Keystone Club, a gym volunteer, and assists in athletic and special club affairs for younger boys.

Words of tribute for the boy have been received from city, school, and religious leaders and their letters of commendation will go into the folder to be sent to the judges in the national contest.

Mayor Early termed the Lowell nominee "a boy of outstanding scholastic and athletic ability as evidenced by the fine record he has compiled in the college preparatory course at LHS, and as cocaptain of his LHS football team."

Lowell High Headmaster Raymond Sullivan, Bartlett School Principal John Cronin, teachers, clergymen, and March of Dimes officials also sent letters of commendation to the "boy of the year."

Veteran football Coach Raymond Riddick, in his letter, stated: "As his football coach I found him to be one of the most active, cooperative, and unselfish boys I have had the privilege of coaching or associating with." The coach called Maskaluk "an outstanding example for the youth of the area."

William Lapointe, civil defense director, and active boys club worker, has conducted the "boy of the year" contest for the club for the past several years and feels that the community has a wonderful chance of winning national honors with this year's nominee.

Boys club Executive Director William Vrettas, in a letter that will be sent to judges in the national contest, stated that Maskaluk has "given untold hours of his time and talent to supervising younger members in the gymnasium program, on bus trips, and had helped the club in waterfront programs.

Vrettas also lauded the boy for his "community service" and said he was proud to recommend him for "boy of the year" honors.

Truth in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, every schoolchild in the United States learns that our system of government is based ultimately on "the consent of the governed."

Our governing institutions derive their original authority from the people, and their continuing operations are, according to this idea, dependent on the will of the people.

One of the first essentials to the success of this system is clearly public access to the important facts of government action. If important truths about government are obscured, distorted, or hidden entirely, then we have not only a moral problem but a threat to our basic system of government as well.

The need for truth in government was further discussed in the Evening Star of Washington on January 20, both in an editorial and in a column by Mr. David Lawrence.

I ask that the two items be reproduced here in the general interest.

TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT

Delaware's Republican Senator WILLIAMS, who played a key role in digging up facts in the Bobby Baker case, thinks the President was less than candid last week in submitting his fiscal 1967 budget estimates to Congress. He urges that Mr. Johnson, while plugging for truth in packaging, should also put in a good word and a few good deeds for truth in Government.

The President said next year's deficit, if Congress approves all of his recommendations, will be only $1.8 billion, the lowest in many years. Senator WILLIAMS believes a more correct estimate of the deficit (and this does not take into account a probable request for a large supplemental appropriation for the war in Vietnam) would be $9.2 billion, not $1.8 billion.

This results, according to the Delaware Senator, from the President's treatment as regular income of such items as accelerated tax payments, the profit from lowering the content of silver coins, sale of copper from the stockpile, and similar items. He does not include in his calculation the request that the reduction in telephone and automobile taxes be restored. Tax acceleration and the profit on the new silver coins alone, again according to the Senator, will amount to $7.44 bilion in fiscal 1967. Since these are nonrecurring revenue items, he thinks this sum should be added to the President's estimated deficit, thereby producing a true deficit of $9.24 billion. Senator WILLIAMS says the basis for the President's estimate is like borrowing on next week's salary to pay this week's grocery bill, and it seems to us that he is right. If he is right, and especially if the cost of the war goes up, Senator WILLIAMS is amply justified in predicting that the President will have to come back to Congress with a request for a drastic tax increase, probably after this year's elections, or accept a destructive and wild inflation. Should there be such an inflation the people who would suffer most are the retired and the aged, all of those living on fixed incomes, for whom the administration professes deep concern.

Senator WILLIAMS made another interesting point. During the last 5 years, he said, the deficits of the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations have exceeded $31.5 billion. This deficit, and the end is by no means in sight, is greater than the total expenditures of the New Deal during the 5-year period from 1933 to 1938.

This comparison prompts two thoughts: (1) Franklin D. Roosevelt, despite the anguished cries of his fiscal critics, must have been a pretty tight man with a dollar. (2) And now, in 1966, the country certainly could do with a little more truth in Government and a little less fiscal sleight of hand.

SENATOR ASKS TRUTH IN GOVERNMENT

(By David Lawrence)

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who has uncovered many irregularities in Government, is a man of rare courage in politics. He now has undertaken in a speech to the Senate to prove that the administration has resorted to sleight-of-hand tactics in the figures given to the public about the budget.

The Delaware Senator calls attention to the fact that President Johnson in his state of the Union message asked for legislation to provide truth in packaging and truth in lending. WILLIAMS says that what is even more necessary is truth in Government.

The American people perhaps do not understand as yet that the Federal Government is collecting this year from corporations much of what it would normally have collected next year, and that, under an accelerated program, the Government for at least 3 years will be collecting more than 100 percent of the taxes actually owed for a given calendar year by corporations.

The Senator says that the withholding-tax acceleration for individuals would bring in $400 million in the next fiscal year. He adds:

"Stated otherwise, this is the same as borrowing on next week's salary to pay this week's grocery bills, and that is exactly what it is.

"I say that a program of truth in Government is needed. The American taxpayers have a right to know whether the labels being put on the Government's financial package are accurate, true descriptions, because based on the Treasury Department's own figures, the estimated deficit for fiscal 1967 is not $1.8 billion, but $9.2 billion.

"In the President's message of last Wednesday night, a further acceleration of the corporate tax payments was recommended. If Congress accedes to the President's request, the Government will collect in fiscal 1967 an additional $3.2 billion in taxes from the corporations.

"This is not counting increased taxes to be received from the reinstated telephone and automobile taxes. I am speaking now only of the accelerated corporation taxes under the President's request. It would move forward $1 billion extra of the corporate taxes into fiscal 1966 and into fiscal 1967, another $3.2 billion."

The Delaware Senator also points out that the Government, by taking away a certain amount of the content of silver in coinage, will be able to credit itself with receipt of $2.5 billion in the next fiscal year over and above what it would have received if the silver had not been commandeered by the Government. This extra money, he says, is, of course, a nonrecurring revenue, but is being included as though it were additional or continuing revenue.

WILLIAMS also reveals that the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles agricultural commodities, owes the U.S. Government more that $12 billion, but has assets much less and shows a deficit of $5.9 billion. He argues that this actual loss "has not been faced by the administration in its budgetary requests," and that a truth in Government policy would correct this misleading information."

Summing up the present financial status of the Federal Government, WILLIAMS declares:

"The deficits of the past 5 years alone have exceeded the total cost of all Government expenditures during the 5 years between 1914 and 1919, a period which included the total cost of World War I."

WILLIAMS insists, moreover, that trust-fund receipts are ir no way to be confused with the administrative budget, and that to quote such figures as an indication of a balanced budget is misleading and does not represent truth in Government.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, one of the liberal Republicans, commented later that WILLIAMS' speech would probably have been more effective as the Republican state of the Union message than what was given over television on Monday as the party's response to the President's televised broadcast.

Strangely enough, what was said by WILLIAMS in his speech to the Senate got very little attention in the press and wasn't the subject of any extensive broadcasts on the air anywhere.

Cleveland Heights High School Patriotism Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the January 1966 graduating class of Cleveland Heights, Ohio, High School chose patriotism as their theme. To carry out a program based on this theme, the young people are printing and distributing some 20,000 booklets on how to display and properly care for our flag. These will be placed in all homes and business places of the Cleveland Heights and University Heights area. In addition, a four-man drum and bugle corps participates each day in the formal flag-raising and lowering ceremony. Members of the senior class each year will be eligible for the corps and the color guard. The ceremony started this semester will be continued each year as a tradition.

This emphasis on patriotism by these young people is something that could well be spread all over our Nation, particularly at this difficult time. When young people such as these seniors at Cleveland Heights High School demonstrate their belief in their flag and country as these do we can rest assured that the future of our Nation is in good hands. As part of my remarks I include an article from the Cleveland Press and a letter written by Mr. Earl A. Graske, 13th District Council Americanism chairman, Ohio American Legion.

HEIGHTS SCHOOL HAS A PROJECT—PATRIOTISM

(By Rick Weiner)

About 20,000 four-page folders on the American flag will be distributed soon to all homes and businesses in Cleveland Heights and University Heights.

Entitled "Stars and Stripes—Our Emblem of Freedom," the folders represent part of the class project of the January 1966, class at Cleveland Heights High School. Members chose patriotism as their theme.

They intend to picture the American flag on the cover of the folder, with the Pledge of Allegiance copied underneath.

Inside pages will list the history of the flag, the flad code and dates it should be displayed, while the back cover will carry the verses of the Star-Spangled Banner.

Goal of the class is to "help educate the people of the proper times and way to display the American flag in our community."

Since the school will print the folders, the only expense involved in the project will be for the paper, estimated to cost $40 to $50. The Cedar-Center Kiwanis Club has agreed to meet this.

Along with the folders the class has started a flag raising and lowering ceremony each day at the school. A four-man drum and bugle corps accompanies a color guard that formally takes care of the flag.

This ceremony, which Principal Eugene Myslenski said will become a tradition at the school, was initiated and is headed by a member of the June 1966 class, Durban Keeney.

Myslenski said the ceremony will be carried out daily. Members of the graduating class will be eligible for the drum and bugle corps and color guard.

Chairmen of the January 1966 class project are Larry Zeiger, Dale Abrams, Susan Ettinger, and Alice Lautman.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
13TH DISTRICT COUNCIL,
Cleveland, Ohio, December 7, 1965.

MR. E. W. MYSLENSKI,
Principal, Cleveland Heights High School,
Cleveland Heights, Ohio.

DEAR MR. MYSLENSKI: It was a pleasure for me to observe the flag-raising ceremony at your high school last Monday morning. After reading about the program of patriotism in the Cleveland Press I just had to come and see it. Please don't get the impression that I came to spy on you and your students that raw, cold day. I came to observe "teenage America" in action and saw it.

The flag was raised properly. The drum and bugle corps was excellent and the drill sergeant was tops. This outfit would be hard to beat in competition.

Please extend my compliments to your senior class for their program of "patriotism." When young people like that believe in their flag and country as they do we citizens and parents may rest assured that the future of our Nation is in good hands.

This program of your students places them in the "typical teenage" group. They are the kind of kids that we as parents are so very proud of. We know that they represent the overwhelming majority of our youth today. Might I steal an expression from the present teenage vernacular and say "Your kids at Cleveland Heights High School are the greatest." Well, they are.

Sincerely,

EARL A. GRASKE,
13th District Americansim Chairman,
American Legion Ohio.

A Questionnaire From Your Congressman, Richard L. Ottinger, 25th District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last September I sent my congressional newsletter to approximately 160,000 postal patrons in the 25th Congressional District of New York. I included in that newsletter to a questionnaire on what I considered to be the major international issues at that time.

The response to this questionnaire was most gratifying. Nearly 15,000 recipients took the time to complete the questionnaire and return it to my office in Yonkers, N.Y. Many took the additional time to include additional comments and a high proportion sent me thoughtful letters dealing with the subjects covered in the questionnaire.

I feel the results of this questionnaire will be interesting and informative to my colleagues in the House of Representatives and I offer herewith a tabulation for inclusion in the RECORD:

A QUESTIONNAIRE FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, RICHARD L. OTTINGER, 25TH DISTRICT, NEW YORK

1. VIETNAM

Do you favor a policy to:

(a) Expand war, bomb North Vietnam cities and Red China sanctuaries and go all-out to "win", despite dangers of Russian and Red Chinese involvement and threat of nuclear war: 24 percent.

(b) Continue administration policy of using limited military force necessary to stop Communist advance in South Vietnam while making initiatives to achieve satisfactory settlement through negotiations and offers to economic assistance: 51 percent.

(c) Stop bombing of North Vietnam, restrict efforts to South Vietnam and settle now on any available basis: 8 percent.

(d) Withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam unilaterally: 6 percent.

(e) Other (specify): 11 percent.

2. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Do you approve the President's action sending U.S. Marines unilaterally without prior consultation with OAS or Latin Ambassadors in internal revolution threatened by local Communists?	56	38	6
(b) In future similar situations should we—			
(i) Rely solely on international organizations even if they fail to act?	15	81	4
(ii) Appeal to international organizations and intervene unilaterally if they fail to act?	77	19	4
(iii) Intervene unilaterally only if there is external Communist invasion and then only after consultation with international organizations and allies?	50	45	5

3. COMMUNIST CHINA

Do you favor increasing contacts with Communist China by:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Having reporters from each side visit the other?	72	25	3
(b) Trade in nonstrategic goods?	44	49	7
(c) Cultural exchange?	63	33	4
(d) Having Peiping participate in disarmament talks?	60	34	6
(e) Diplomatic recognition and admission to U.N. even if this means breaking with Nationalist China?	25	67	8
(f) Diplomatic recognition and admission to U.N. if question of Security Council veto and separate seat for Nationalist China can be resolved?	51	41	8
—or—			
(g) No increased relationship with Communist China?	45	48	7

4. FOREIGN AID

I. Do you favor economic and technical aid to:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Latin American countries (through Alliance for Progress)?	83	12	5
(b) "Neutral" countries, such as India?	56	34	10
(c) Countries with pro-U.S. policies only?	49	42	9

II. Do you favor revision of aid policies:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Adopting Senator Fulbright's suggestion to end all bilateral aid and give only through international organizations?	26	54	20
(b) Restricting economic assistance to international banks and food for peace, and technical aid to expanded Peace Corps-type programs?	39	42	19
(c) Giving greater emphasis to encouraging U.S. investment abroad?	52	32	16
(d) Giving tariff and other trade preferences to underdeveloped countries?	57	27	16
(e) Trading in nonstrategic goods with Communist countries?	48	43	9
(f) Refusing access to U.S. ports to countries whose ships call at Red China or Cuba?	42	47	11

III. Is the size of our foreign aid commitment:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Too large?	71	14	15
(b) Too small?	15	57	28
(c) About right?	40	33	27

5. UNITED NATIONS

Do you favor:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
(a) Administration's decision to reactivate General Assembly by not insisting on loss of vote for failure by a member to pay peacekeeping assessments?	40	50	10
(b) Expanding U.S. reliance on U.N. even if we risk occasional adverse votes?	56	35	9
(c) Repealing the Connally reservation which permits nations to unilaterally withdraw cases from the World Court?	37	33	30
(d) U.S. subscription to Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Treaty, and Human Rights Conventions?	71	8	21
(e) U.N. Charter revision to provide weighted voting which would reduce influence of small and weak nations?	40	34	17
(f) Withdrawing from the U.N. if Communist China is seated?	22	71	7

U.S.S. "Glover" (AGDE-1) Commissioned; Admiral Weakley Hails Unique Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, among the historic events which took place during the recent congressional recess was the commissioning of the U.S.S. *Glover* (AGDE-1), the Navy's first escort research ship, at the Boston Naval Shipyard on November 13, 1965. It was my privilege to be present as this vessel—named in honor of Brig. Gen. John Glover of Marblehead, Mass.—joined the fleet.

Vice Adm. Charles E. Weakley, USN, commander, Antisubmarine Warfare Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, delivered the principal address, hailing the unique role the *Glover* is designed to perform, and I believe his message holds interest for all concerned with our defense and our efforts to assure peace. Before I present his remarks, however, I wish to record a few other facts about the U.S.S. *Glover*, her historic namesake and her commissioning ceremony.

General Glover gained fame as the organizer and commander of what became known as the "Amphibious Regiment" of the Revolutionary War and as the owner of the first vessel of the so-called Washington Fleet, the schooner *Hannah*. This American naval pioneer, who was born in 1732 in my own home city of Salem, Mass., but resided most of his life in nearby Marblehead, was the man who, with his especially trained personnel, ferried General Washington and his troops across the Delaware for the attack on Trenton.

Thus, it is highly appropriate that a pioneering ship of our modern Navy should bear the name of General Glover. This 3,426-ton escort research vessel is 414 feet, 6 inches in length. Her primary mission during peacetime is to test advanced antisubmarine equipment, procedures, and tactics which may be used on future classes of escorts. To perform their wartime missions, *Glover* class escorts will employ antisubmarine rockets, drone antisubmarine helicopters, and acoustic homing torpedoes. As a pioneer, the *Glover* has a propulsion system unlike most other ships; instead of propellers, she employs a directed water jet to push her through the seas. For this method of propulsion, water is picked up in the forward part of the vessel, accelerated, and discharged at the stern.

The U.S.S. *Glover* was built at the Bath Iron Works Corp. shipyard in Maine, where she was launched on April 17, 1965. With numerous other descendants looking on, her sponsors were two great-great-great-granddaughters of John Glover, Mrs. William F. Pederson, Sr., of Wollaston, Mass., and Mrs. Claude Vernon Signor of Coos Bay, Oreg.

Rear Adm. William B. Sieglaff, USN, Commandant of the 1st Naval District, placed the *Glover* in commission at Boston last November 13. Assuming command was Comdr. William W. Wilson, USN, of New York City, whose ship's company of 14 officers and 211 enlisted men are now carrying out her assignment with the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, with Newport, R.I., as her home port.

The U.S.S. *Glover's* mission was further cited in this commissioning address delivered by Vice Admiral Weakley, Commander of the Atlantic Fleet's Antisubmarine Warfare Force, following his introduction by the vessel's new commanding officer:

Thank you very much Captain Wilson.

Congressman BATES, Admiral Sieglaff, Mrs. Pederson, distinguished guests, personnel of the ship's company, U.S.S. *Glover*, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a particular pleasure for me to participate in this splendid and traditional ceremony in which the Navy's first escort research ship is to be commissioned.

An honor because of the character of the commissioning—it is a unique moment in the life of a ship.

A pleasure for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that it brings me back into this New England area of fine people and splendid workmanship; an area steeped in the traditions of our beloved country.

From the moment Commander Wilson gives the order, "Set the watch," this ship becomes an instrument to carry out the national policy.

From that time onward, she assumes a character, and will gain a service reputation—which stems not from the steel plates which form her structure, but a reputation which stems from the combination of personalities of the people who will find their work and their lives within her.

The utility of the U.S.S. *Glover* will not be limited to wartime combat. She is one of a kind. Her peacetime role is to assist in research in the field of antisubmarine warfare; a form of warfare which has been described by our fleet commander, Adm. Thomas Moorer, as the most difficult and complex of all.

What is the importance of antisubmarine warfare to this great country of ours? World Wars I and II resulted in a shift of the power balances in the world. Whereas in times past we carried on behind the benevolent shield of British seapower, and the benevolent shield of French landpower, following the general line of isolationism which, for our young country, was so wisely dictated by our first great President, more recently we have found it necessary to build our own shield.

I would note in passing that we had to construct a shield which we could carry indefinitely, without deleterious effect upon our own way of life, because the shield was to be a defense, and not an aggressive mechanism.

Faced with the threatening posture of international communism, we knew that the shield must be carried, not in a 100-yard dash, nor a quarter-mile run, but it must be carried throughout a marathon of indefinite length.

In this situation we helped develop the United Nations, and then we entered into NATO, and then into SEATO. We belong to the Organization of American States. These are maritime coalitions, joined together by the seas—not separated by them.

In addition, the technological explosion has brought forth the need for many new materials, not all of which are available in sufficient quantity within our boundaries.

Our economy demands many imports from overseas, imports of large bulk and weight, for which the most economic transportation is by ship. Of the 38 different materials which go to making up the telephones in your homes, more than half are imported. Of the 77 strategic materials required for the building of the implements of war and peace—missiles, rockets, jet aircraft, tanks, electronics—some 66 come to us from overseas.

The ships which come into our country with these imports must be defended where they are, on the surface of the world's oceans.

The ships which go forth to carry support and aid to our allies must be defended where they are, on the surface of the oceans.

The ships which serve to project our power outward, amphibious forces, deckloads of aircraft, gun batteries, missiles, and the necessary support to our own forces which are emplaced in so many countries overseas, these too, we must be prepared to defend where they are, and in time of war their major opponent on the high seas is the submarine.

Antisubmarine warfare capability is not an end in itself, but it is a necessity to the success of almost every seagoing operation.

The U.S.S. *Glover*, by extending the horizons of the state of the art, can contribute mightily in this essential matter. She represents a bold and unique approach to extending our capability in surface ship antisubmarine warfare. Incidentally, not many people realize the tremendously significant change that has taken place since World War II.

During both World Wars I and II, the destroyer did an almost impossible job. Destroyers had to physically pass through the complete weapon range of the submarine before they could lay a finger upon their opponent. This is no longer true.

Under reasonable environmental conditions, the destroyer can detect and attack her quarry before good torpedo ranges for the enemy are reached.

It is most fitting that this ship be named for Brig. Gen. John Glover.

General Glover was a Revolutionary War hero who as the war drew near formed an "amphibious regiment." This too, was a bold and unique approach to a military problem.

General Glover's amphibious regiment was made up of hearty sailing men from Marblehead. They made good seagoing infantrymen since they had learned the disciplines of the sea. His troops were first used to protect Marblehead and nearby Beverly. They were instrumental in providing the amphibious lift needed in the retreat from Long Island. His amphibious troops transported Washington across the Delaware and led the advance on Trenton.

When American fighting men engage in amphibious warfare, they are following in the wake of General Glover and his Marblehead sailor-soldiers. We would call them marines, today.

The ship which now bears his proud name will continue to improve protection for the amphibious fighting man. The ship as we see her now is an amazingly complex machine. She represents the most advanced scientific knowledge and technology available in a wide variety of fields. All of these have been carefully, even lovingly, combined in her by shipbuilders whose work is more nearly an art than a science.

So today as she is poised before us, ready for active service, she represents many advanced, forward-looking concepts. All of these technical advances will place unusually heavy burdens upon her crew. They must master this complexity. They must learn how to operate and how to maintain *Glover's* equipment and how to employ her efficiently.

Since much of this equipment is new, no final doctrine exists for its employment. *Glover's* crew will be blazing a trail for other crews to follow. Although many of their problems will be new ones, many others will be old and familiar to Navy men.

Principle among these problems are those concerned with men. This is a problem that Gen. John Glover also faced. Then as now, the sturdiest fighting ships were only as good as their crews made them.

If it is to have effect, the fine technology and shipbuilding skill which has gone into this ship must be complemented by its men with diligent training, meticulous seamanship, and unswerving devotion to duty.

The standards of excellence and the spirit they will establish in *Glover*, beginning today, will set the tone for their ship for years to come.

The knowledge of the importance of their mission to the destroyer type ships of the future will be a handsome compensation for their efforts.

I congratulate you, Commander Wilson, and your ship's company upon your new assignment.

Good luck, and smooth sailing.

Eleven Hundred Pay Tribute to Retiring Mayor Della Chiesa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, November 14, 1965, I was privileged to attend the farewell dinner for retiring Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, of Quincy, Mass.

For 12 consecutive years, this dedicated public servant has supervised the growth and improvement of a city which has successfully combined pervasive historical tradition with a 20th-century outlook.

During the years that Mayor Della Chiesa and I served together in the Massachusetts General Court, I came to know him well, and to respect his fine personal qualities and abilities. On many occasions since, the dispensation of my duties has brought me in touch with Quincy's city hall and the always courteous cooperation of its mayor. His sense of duty and compassion for his people have endeared him permanently to the heart of this great city.

I would like to insert here for the attention of my colleagues and the Nation an article which appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger of November 15, 1965, as well as a copy of the evening's program:

One Thousand One Hundred Pay Tribute to Retiring Mayor Della Chiesa

(By Howard White)

Hull.—"Amelio Della Chiesa needs no monuments and wants none. Nor does he even need this testimonial dinner tonight. For he has received his greatest testimonial time and again at the polls."

So observed Gov. John A. Volpe last night. But need a testimonial or not, Mayor Della Chiesa and his wife were honored by some 1,100 persons, a capacity crowd at the Surf, Nantasket.

NO MONUMENT NEEDED

The friendship dinner marked Mayor Della Chiesa's impending retirement after 12 years as the city's chief executive. He will continue, at least through next year, as one of the city's representatives in the general court.

"We need more men with the character, the dedication, and the integrity of Mel in public life," said Governor Volpe, principal speaker at the dinner. "We need more citizens like Mel in Massachusetts and in America.

"And while we are sorry to see him leave one of his public roles, our regret is tempered by our knowledge and our gratefulness that his services are not entirely lost to us," the Governor added.

"The citizens of Quincy will not need to erect a monument to Amelio Della Chiesa," the Governor said, "and he would not want one, because he would not want anyone to spend the money." His reference to the mayor's reputation for a tight-fisted control over the taxpayer's money drew laughter and applause from the audience.

"But the vital new public buildings constructed in Quincy at economical cost during his administration will be the best monuments to Amelio Della Chiesa. They will be living monuments to his concern for the welfare of his community, monuments which future generations will use and enjoy and by which they will remember a great and devoted mayor who planned ahead of them," said Governor Volpe.

"PAUL REVERE PATRIOT"

And he made Mayor Della Chiesa a "Paul Revere Patriot," an honorary order whose privileges, he noted, include dumping tea into Boston Harbor. Mayor Della Chiesa, later referring to his new privilege, suggested a lot of people might prefer that he be allowed to dump the city's rubbish into Boston Harbor instead.

Toastmaster for the dinner was Paul C. Reardon of Hingham, associate justice of the State supreme judicial court. Judge Reardon, a former Quincy resident, noted that "standards of public service were set nearly two centuries ago, many of them in the farm kitchens of what is now Quincy. They have found adherents in those to whom city and town affairs were confided from time to time. We honor the mayor as the latest and as an entirely worthy captain of the local government," he said.

"He did not take his duties lightly, and he worked at the job," added Judge Reardon. "Who among us has given more to Quincy and the country in these last years than has he?"

"He has long been aware that the noblest motive is the public good," said Justice Reardon.

Like many of the other speakers, the general chairman, William J. Martin, Sr., paid tribute to Mrs. Della Chiesa as well as to the mayor. And he presented Mrs. Della Chiesa with two tickets for an all-expense-paid vacation in Bermuda—leaving it up to her to decide whom she would take with her.

U.S. Representative James A. Burke, Democrat, of Milton, a former statehouse colleague of Mayor Della Chiesa, paid tribute to him as "a fine, dedicated, devoted public servant."

HUMPHREY TRIBUTE

Praise for the mayor from the Federal Government also came in a letter from Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, whom the mayor earlier this year made an honorary citizen of Quincy.

"You will always be an integral part of all that you helped create and nurture," the vice president wrote. "You will be remembered with gratitude and affection."

Praise for the mayor from his colleagues in the house of representatives was brought by Representative Sidney Q. Curtiss, Republican, of Sheffield, house minority leader, who read a resolve of congratulations that the house passed in one of the mayor's rare absences several weeks ago. "It took about 3 weeks to get the mayor out of his seat so we could pass this," he said.

Mayor Della Chiesa's response to an evening praising him was to praise Quincy and its employees, officials, and citizens.

"I always praise Quincy and that comes right from my heart, because I know that we have a good city. I don't know of any city that renders the services that we render here in the city of Quincy," he said.

And with characteristic attention to financial detail, he cataloged some of those services—the schools, streets, fire and police departments, hospital, recreation programs, libraries, and other programs. He said the city's budget has risen about 600 percent, from $5 to $30 million—since he has been in city government—while the tax rate increase has been much less sharp.

And he urged people to help him leave the city in sound financial shape for his successor by paying their bills.

Head table guests at the event included the Reverend John D. Banks of Bethany Congregational Church who gave the invocation and benediction; the mayor-elect, Senator James R. McIntyre, Democrat, of Quincy; and Mrs. Edna B. Austin, former city councilor, who presented the bronze plaque that was the city's principal gift to the mayor.

GROUP TRIBUTES

Representatives of several organizations presented their groups' tributes to Mayor Della Chiesa.

They included—the Norfolk County American Legion Council, represented by Robert Leo Eng, and the Quincy American Legion.

Friendship Dinner in Honor of Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa, at the Surf Ballroom, Nantasket Beach, November 14, 1965

"MEL"

Born in Quincy July 31, 1901, of Italian parents, Amelio Della Chiesa is the first man of his race—the race that gave the world Dante, Verdi, Raphael, Michelangelo, and Leonardo DaVinci—to be elected mayor of Quincy. His 12 years in the city's top municipal office is a record.

His services as city councilor, mayor, school committee chairman, and State representative are concentrated in 23 successive years, as he served concurrently in several offices. Had his elective service been spread out, it would have covered 52 years.

Hard work has been the motif of his life. At 10 he was selling soda pop to stoneworkers in his native South Quincy; at 16 he was a Quincy Trade School graduate and a journeyman plumber; at 17, a master plumber, the youngest in Massachusetts; at 18, the head of his own plumbing concern while still a teenager; at 52, retired from a successful business career to devote his entire time to public service.

Mayor Della Chiesa's normal workday begins at sunup and ends at midnight. "I can count on the fingers of one hand the quiet nights I have spent at home in the past 12 years."

While the badge of success is hard work, Mayor Della Chiesa believes that hard work is not enough—honesty and frugality are its necessary hand maidens. These three qualities, translated into action, have enabled him to get things done while holding the tax rate in reasonable check.

When critics called him a pinchpenny mayor, Mr. Della Chiesa looks back at the total vote of the last four elections and smiles: Della Chiesa, 70,773; opponents, 36,541.

Achievements during the Della Chiesa regime include: Reorganization of the cemetery department, street construction by private contractors under competitive bidding, and contract collection of rubbish and garbage—effecting a total saving of $700,000 a year which is $3.50 on the tax rate. His austerity budgets, his no-hire-no-fire policy, his nonpolitical appointments resulted in further saving. His conservative spending policy is reflected in major capital outlay projects such as the $10,000,000 school construction program, an enlarged hospital, a new library and fire station.

The Patriot Ledger recently summed up Mr. Della Chiesa's long mayoralty: "Quincy will have to look long and hard for a person with the intimate knowledge of municipal government, the high standard of integrity, and the willingness to devote the long hours to the job that Mayor Della Chiesa has demonstrated."

Mayor and Mrs. Della Chiesa, the former Miss Evelyn Resell, gave their only son, Lt. Walter Albert Della Chiesa, a West Pointer, to their country when his jet fighter crashed off Korea June 22, 1950.

Fred Hunt.

PROGRAM

Associate Justice Paul C. Reardon, toastmaster.

Invocation: The Reverend John D. Banks.

Dinner: Introduction of head table guests, toastmaster.

Remarks: Congressman James A. Burke.

Speaker: Gov. John A. Volpe.

Presentation of the citizens of Quincy: Mrs. Edna B. Austin.

Response: Mayor Amelio Della Chiesa.

Benediction: The Reverend John D. Banks.

Reception.

Music: Baron Hugo's orchestra.

AMELIO DELLA CHIESA FRIENDSHIP DINNER

William J. Martin, general chairman; Heslip E. Sutherland, treasurer; Mrs. Hattiemay Thomas, secretary.

Banquet committee: John F. Wipfler, chairman; Russell Halley, and G. Ralph DiBona.

Flower committee: Mrs. Joseph O. Morris, president, Bayside Gardners of Squantum; Mrs. Edward O. Gourdin, president, Germantown Garden Club; Mrs. F. Arthur Heath, president, Wollaston Garden Club.

General committee: A. Wendall Clarke, chairman; James D. Asher, and John P. Flavin.

Gift committee: Douglas A. Randall, chairman; Thomas S. Burgin, and Dr. Edward S. Mann.

Program committee: Forrest I. Neal, chairman; William C. Edwards, and Winthrop Sargent IV.

Protocol and decorations: Mrs. Joseph MacRitchie, chairman; Miss Dorothy Osborne, and William O'Connell.

Publicity committee: Percy Lane, chairman; Herbert Fontaine, James Collins, Henry Bosworth, William J. DeLargy.

Reception committee: Dr. Charles Djerf, chairman; James F. McCormick, Sr., Dr. Edward S. Mann, Mrs. Alice Mitchell, Francis F. Anselmo, Charles T. Sweeny.

Social hour committee: Matthew Cushing, chairman; Chief Thomas F. Gorman.

Ticket committee: Alexander Smith, chairman; Edward T. Lewis, Carmine D'Olympio, William J. Short, Jr., Henry J. Williams, Mrs. G. Leland Stevenson, Lino A. Ponti.

GOD BLESS AMERICA

"God bless America, land that I love,
Stand beside her and guide her
Through the night with a light from above;
From the mountains, to the prairies, to the oceans white with foam,
God bless America, my home sweet home."

—Irving Berlin.

HEAD TABLE

The Reverend John D. Banks, minister, Bethany Congregational Church; the Honorable James R. McIntyre, mayor-elect, city of Quincy; William J. Martin, board chairman, South Shore National Bank.

Mrs. Amelio Della Chiesa, the Honorable Amelio Della Chiesa, mayor, city of Quincy; the Honorable Paul C. Reardon, associate justice, Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; Mrs. Edna B. Austin, attorney.

The Honorable James A. Burke, Congressman, 11th Massachusetts District; the Honorable Sidney Q. Curtiss, minority leader, State house of representatives.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE RECORD

Ward 3 councilor, three 2-year terms, 1944-49; councilor at large, four 2-year terms, 1950-57; city council president, 1948; mayor under plan E, two 2-year terms, 1954-57 (elected by the council); mayor under plan A, four 2-year terms, 1958-65 (elected by the people); State representative, seven 2-year terms, 1953-66; chairman of the school committee, six 2-year terms, 1954-65.

Sea Research Receives More Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the field of ocean exploration, or the probe of the earth's "wet space," is receiving more and more recognition. The oceanographic pursuits of the United States are becoming a matter of concern to not only scientists, but those in Government circles as well.

Recently one of our distinguished colleagues, Congressman Joseph Karth, of Minnesota, addressed the National Space Club on the benefits of sea research, and how they compare to the economic aspects of outer space.

Congressman Karth, a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as well as the House Science and Astronautics Committee, is in a position to bring to the Congress a unique blend of experience. He has knowledge of uses of outer space, as well as the seas, or inner space.

I ask that Congressman Karth's address of January 18 before the National Space Club be included in its entirety at this point in the Record.

Potential of Oceanography

Perhaps I should begin with a personal note on why I am talking about oceanography at a Space Club luncheon.

Last summer I became a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. Later, in the fall, I went on the Oceanography Subcommittee because I think it deals with an extremely important area, and because oceanography is becoming increasingly related to space.

I should be quick to point out that I am no expert on oceanography. But I have been digging into it and want to outline some of my preliminary thinking, particularly because we're at a critical stage on deciding how to proceed with oceanography development.

One of the earliest congressional oceanography experts is here in the audience today. From March to June 1959 Chairman Miller (Congressman George Miller, California) headed a special subcomimttee which reviewed "Oceanography in the United States." He has consistently advocated a stronger national program and a more sensible organizational approach. Mr. Chairman, in addition to other things I think it only fair that I recognize you as the real congressional father of oceanography.

A moment ago I mentioned the relationship between oceanography and space activities. For a few minutes I intend to outline, what seems to me, some of the important points about this relationship.

One important contribution of aerospace technology has been general acceptance of the "total systems approach." A closely connected idea is the growing awareness that we need to view our world environment as a whole. And I have a hunch that in retrospect, historians will consider this concept as one of the truly significant ideas of our century.

As part of our environment, the sea is not "independent"—it is greatly affected by outside forces: the rotation of the earth and the movements of the sun and moon result in events we all can observe every time we go to the beach. Less apparent are the effects of the direct income and outgo of radiant solar energy and the vital interchange between sea and atmosphere and land.

This suggests that, as in the broad field of space, hardly any aspect of the sea is capable of adequate analysis without coordination of all the fundamental natural sciences and engineering. In this sense, as with the study of space, oceanography is not a science in itself. Rather, it is a combination of various sciences and fields of engineering to study the sea in all its aspects—including the complex interrelationships with our total environment.

An approach of this kind leads directly to what a number of people are suggesting as specific correlation between space "knowhow" and the problems being faced in oceanography. I'll just mention a few major areas: (1) Reliability and efficiency requirements, (2) systems management experience, (3) structures and materials, (4) operating in a hostile environment outside the atmosphere, (5) instrumentation and sensors—especially in standardizing, (6) computer, guidance and power systems, and finally (7) vehicle design and construction.

But I'm just summarizing when I talk about specific areas such as these. Most certainly, I'm not telling you anything that is startling. Many aerospace firms have already grasped the point. For example:

(1) North American Aviation has a new ocean systems facility which will draw heavily on the firm's space effort. It's no accident that it is located in their space and information systems division.

(2) Lockheed has established a marine laboratory.

(3) Nortronics is working on the Navy's deep submergence systems project.

(4) The underseas division of Westinghouse is now building a new research and test facility.

And (5) General Dynamics' Electric Boat Division has been in the field for a long time.

Incidentally, I understand that some people have become somewhat disenchanted because certain corporate investments of the early 1960's haven't started to pay off yet. My advice is this: Stick around for a while. Small opportunities are often the beginning of great enterprises.

Just this month, there have been two solid indications that space and oceanography are more than "kissing cousins":

(1) The Naval Oceanographic Office has undertaken the coordination of all investigations about possible applications of manned earth orbital operations in the field of oceanography. I intend to suggest that their interest be expanded formally to include unmanned operations as well.

(2) A symposium was held here in Washington last week on "Man's Extension Into the Sea." It was interesting to note that its cosponsors included not only such expected organizations as the Marine Technology Society—but the AIAA as well.

Having, I believe, established why I'm not out in left field by talking oceanography to a space group, I'd now like to turn to why the subject is so important.

For most of human history we have considered the oceans as little more than hunting grounds for fishermen and highways for ships. Of course, the shores have always provided recreation—and recently there has been the added pleasure of "bikini watching."

But for the future I strongly believe that we can expect a greatly expanded "ocean consciousness" as man turns to the sea with new eyes and new ideas. I see this as part of a broad scientific advance which may lead to profound changes in life as we now know it on this planet. In effect, we are taking the first, awkward steps to eventually controlling our environment—rather than letting it dominate us.

More specifically, as far as the sea is concerned, there is a growing consensus that:

(1) We will be able to obtain economically much of the world's fresh water needs from sea water within the next 10 years or so.

(2) We will be able to harness tides as a source of power.

(3) Ways can be found to help control the world's climate by controlling or using ocean currents.

(4) The oceans and, of course, the seabed and subsoil of the ocean basins are a vast potential source of many metals which are rapidly becoming in short supply.

(5) We can look to the oceans to solve some of the world's food problems as we learn to "farm" instead of just hunt. While more than 70 percent of the earth's surface is covered by water, not more than 1 percent of its total food supplies are derived from it.

I would like to dwell on this point for a moment. Recently, Dr, Lawrence Gould, Director of the U.S. Antarctic program during the latest IGY reported, "These Antarctic waters are so protein rich that it is generally agreed among scientists that acre for acre they are potentially richer food sources than any other equivalent areas of our planet * * * clearly here is an enormous, potentially rich food supply for an increasingly hungry planet."

I don't think Dr. Gould's comment can be lightly dismissed. Our planet's food problem is acute, and despite the superb performance of the American farmer, he can't solve it all by himself. Even if all of our surplus food were somehow provided to the rest of the world, it wouldn't be nearly enough. In fact, some experts tell us that in 10 years, U.S. citizens will consume every ounce the ingenious American farmer can produce.

Comments are being made widely "that there have always been hungry people and famine is part of the history of man." But what these people miss is a growing determination to attack and defeat one of mankind's most ancient enemies. The potential benefits of oceanography will clearly be powerful weapons in this attack.

While there seems to be relatively little controversy about the potential benefits of work in oceanography, how to go about realizing these benefits has been a cause of continuing debate for several years. The reasons for this debate are as complex as Government itself, but I'll take a crack at them.

One reason seems to be that the focus of our attention in oceanography has undergone radical changes during the past decade. Yesterday, we were interested in it as a science. Today, we are thinking more about man working and living on and in the ocean. We are thinking about the engineering and technological problems connected with harvesting the resources of the sea. This kind of transition from science to use is never made easily—but it must be made.

Another reason for the extensive debate is rooted in the fact that several administrations and the Conghess have had differing points of view on how the Nation's effort in oceanography should be organized.

No small factor in this debate has been congressional concern that 22 agencies (by one count) are involved with oceanography. I can't find any record of it, but I'd be willing to bet that even the Army and the Air Force have an oceanography office tucked away somewhere—just in case.

The activities of these 22 agencies are brought together by the Interagency Committee on Oceanography which is under the Federal Council for Science and Technology. Basically, administration witnesses before the Congress have said this arrangement is satisfactory. The Congress has not agreed with them. Over the past several years it has considered these alternatives:

(1) Beefing up the present coordination setup.

(2) Establishing a new independent agency—I might add it has been referred to as a "wet-NASA."

(3) Establishing a National Oceanographic Council headed by the Vice President—it would be much like the present Space Council.

And (4) Establishing a national commission to study and recommend an overall plan for an adequate national program .

Of these various approaches, only the first, in the past, has been acceptable to administration witnesses. However, during the first session of this Congress, both the House and Senate passed a bill based on other approaches.

(1) The Senate bill, S. 944, proposed a Council at a higher level than the present Interagency Committee on Oceanography. The Council would be headed by the Vice President. A study commission also is provided for to recommend plans to the Council for implementation.

(2) The House version omits the National Oceanographic Council, and anticipates that the President would use existing mechanisms in the Office of Science and Technology, and the Federal Council to implement these proposals. It also establishes a self-liquidating Commission which would recommend plans for a program to the Presiednt.

Actually, I believe both bills agree on far more points than they differ.

Both broadly define "oceanography" and "marine science." This is a major contribution to our understanding of the scope of the national effort.

Both set forth a declaration of national policy and purpose so badly needed to give direction and stability.

Both provide for a representative, self-liquidating study commission.

Both call for annual Executive reports and the development of long-range annual plans and budgets.

Both provide funds for independent, governmentwide central planning.

Importantly, both bills emphasize the need for political action now. They differ only in the degree of required action and the level at which this action and leadership should be exercised. In proposing the Cabinet-level Council, with its own staff, the Senate bill tends to go much further than the House. The House prefers its version because we believe the legislation has a better chance of being approved by the administration.

In any event, it is my opinion that recent discussion and action in the Congress has gone a long way toward focusing attention on two very important points:

(1) Oceanography is not getting satisfactory attention within the administration under existing organizational arrangements. What seems to be needed as much as anything is to get oceanography out into the open in a more conspicuous position.

There is a distinct feeling within the Congress that the ICO—Interagency Committee on Oceanography—is buried too far down in the Government hierarchy. On this point, you don't need to be connected with space to know that Jim Webb heads NASA—but I would guess that a relatively few would know who is the Chairman of the ICO.

The existing organization gives rise for concern on the part of the Congress as to whether there is a national program. I mean this in the sense of whether it is screened and adopted to fit a set of national priorities in contrast to it being a simple addition of priorities arising from 22 different agencies.

(2) A second major concern on the part of the Congress is that oceanography is not receiving an adequate allocation of resources. Aside from the Navy antisubmarine warfare effort in fiscal year 1966, our oceanographic budget totaled about $140 million. Perhaps it's not a valid comparison to make, but this past week, Sears Roebuck announced that it would spend $200 million on store expansion during 1966.

In a nutshell, an investment of $140 million for oceanography does not seem to be consistent with our present capability and the potential benefits. The present rate of growth of the composite budget is about 8 to 15 percent per year. I won't presume to say what it ought to be—because I think this is the kind of question that we in the Congress would like to have considered by either a council or a commission. I will say, however, that I do think such a rate of growth is not fast enough.

In making this judgment, I am not unaware that there is danger in building up too rapidly. Professional oceanographers have, in fact, expressed their fears of swift proliferation—beyond the capacity of the existing qualified and experienced scientists and engineers to train increasing numbers of recruits.

There is something to be said for this point of view; when it is considered that there are only about 3,000 professionals working the field; and when it is considered that there are only 12 schools teaching 300 graduate students and turning out 20 Ph. D.'s a year. But this view overlooks one vital point.

An expanded oceanographic program will require the talents of many disciplines—not just those of professional oceanographers. In a sense, then, oceanographers will no longer have the isolation they have been accustomed to—but will be exposed to the rough and tumble world of teamwork on a large scale. Therefore, it seems to me that a shortage of oceanographers is not as critical as it might appear at first glance.

This is not to say our educational program is in good shape; it isn't. Twenty Ph. D.'s a year—of whom about half are replacements—won't be sufficient for the long pull. Energetic efforts should be taken to step up the pace—as has been done in the area of space. For example, we could well use the NASA-type facility grant for universities on an expanded scale in the field of oceanography, with emphasis on an interdisciplinary approach.

In concluding, I want to return to another facet of the space-oceanography relationship. As we move to considering more ambitious space programs—such as manned expeditions to Mars or the moons of Jupiter and Saturn—you all know what happens to the price tags. By comparison, Apollo may look cheap.

Frankly, I don't foresee general acceptance of the enormous outlays for such programs until we have solved the continually worsening home planet problems of hunger and poverty. This leads me to believe that in years to come there will be much greater emphasis on fields such as oceanography which have the potential for helping to solve them. By greater emphasis I mean far more than any of us might realize today; because true progress, it has been said, consists not so much in increasing our needs as in diminishing our wants.

I choose not to talk about this in terms of an "oceanography gap," even though I'm convinced we are not preeminent in the field. But I hope we don't wait for a sharp stimulus which forces us into a competition. Perhaps we should move more rapidly because we have the capability and it ought to be done for the benefits it can provide for us and the rest of mankind. How fast we move to meet the challenge of the ocean depends in large measure on the political action we take today.

The 9,500 Fourth-Class Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the December 1965 issue of Postmasters Advocate, the official publication of the National League of Postmasters of the United States, devoted its cover picture to a recent historic event in the 10th Congressional District of Texas.

I refer to the swearing-in ceremonies of the new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. "Larry" O'Brien, in the little post office at Hye, Tex.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include from this issue of Postmasters Advocate a splendid editorial of tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson, for the special recognition he gave on this occasion to our Nation's 9,500 fourth-class post offices.

The article follows:

THANK YOU, MR. PRESIDENT

Who said that fourth-class post offices are a thing of the past and all washed up?

Observe our cover this month; that picture was made in a post office of the fourth class—at Hye, Tex., which is located 3 miles from the LBJ Ranch, home of our President.

Yes, President Lyndon B. Johnson deliberately chose a fourth-class post office as the site for the swearing-in ceremony of the new Postmaster General, Lawrence F. "Larry" O'Brien, as a reminder that the large and the small are equally the concern of Government.

Incidentally, Hye Postmaster Levi A. Deike, who is a member of the National League of Postmasters, also is in the picture. Postmaster Deike, who has been the President's friend since childhood, showed his two distinguished guests around the combination post office, general store, bus stop, and feedstore—following a snack of crackers and cheese in the backroom.

We're thrilled that our President has emphasized the importance of rural America in his thinking. As he pointed out, both the rural post office and the country store made very important contributions in the development of the frontier lands.

We state unequivocally that the small post offices, and the postmasters thereof, will always make a significant and important contribution to the development of America.

We thank President Johnson for this recognition of the 9,500 fourth-class post offices and their postmasters.

After all, the Postmasters Advocate was originally named, the Fourth Class Postmaster. And, everyone knows, that the National League of Postmasters has long been the champion of the small postmasters and post offices.

We hail—and salute—President Lyndon B. Johnson on this historic occasion.

The Holding Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, support for the views of Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin relative to the war in Vietnam is growing.

The New York Times on Friday, January 21, editorially declared as follows:

> At the present, American forces are secure in their coastal positions and cannot be involuntarily dislodged. General Gavin's recent advice not to expand the war but to continue efforts to negotiate the peace, has the force of logic on its side.

On January 17, in an interview telecast in New York over station WNDT and reported the following day by the New York Times, Associate Editor James B. Reston, of the New York Times, took a position almost identical to that expressed by General Gavin. Mr. Reston asserted that the war in Vietnam should be pursued as one of limited objectives, that the correct way was "the middle way." *This, he said would rule out both* continued intensification of the war or peace on terms that would lose the country.

The United States can defend the perimeter of Saigon, Mr. Reston said, and the coastal areas where most of the people of South Vietnam live. This is very different, he added, from searching out the enemy through the elephant grass. Mr. Reston said:

> We are just at the beginning of an enormous battle of Asia. That battle will go on for the rest of the century and Vietnam is not the end of it but the beginning. If we win in Vietnam, the battle will still go on and what I am afraid of is that we will try to score a great smashing victory, thinking that will end it all, which it won't. Therefore, I would limit the objective.

In an interview published in the Milwaukee, *Wis., Journal, on January 16,* Senator GAYLORD NELSON conceded that "there are no easy answers to the agonizing dilemma facing America in Vietnam." He continued:

> But of all the grim alternatives, the wisest choice is to continue with great patience to seek a negotiated settlement, while firmly refusing to escalate the conflict further.

Senator NELSON said he believed that there was "no practical hope in achieving our aims" through escalation.

He warned that escalation carried with it "a very real possibility of an Asian-wide war in which America would waste her resources and young men in a slaughter that could achieve nothing but those desperate conditions of chaos ideal for the spread of communism."

Senator NELSON said he agreed with still another distinguished American who has expressed a similar view: George F. Kennan, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, who recently advocated a campaign to deescalate the Vietnam war.

Since last July, the distinguished Columnist Walter Lippmann has held this basic view of the situation.

In the latest issue of Newsweek magazine, dated January 31, 1966, Mr. Lippmann again asserts this view stating that:

> The holding strategy enables us to honor our commitments to the South Vietnamese, who would be lost if we withdrew precipitately from the whole country. The holding strategy, moreover, relieves our troops of the impossible task of occupying the villages of South Vietnam and keeping the Vietcong from overrunning them when we leave. The holding strategy is built upon our seapower, which is our strong right arm, not upon the ability of American soldiers fighting 8,000 miles away to make secure 2,500 villages.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to note that the holding strategy advocated by General Gavin "is now receiving wide support in the Congress and in the press."

In an identical vein in his column in today's Washington Post, Mr. Lippmann makes the point that:

> It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

Under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I include here Mr. Lippmann's column from the January 31 issue of Newsweek magazine and the January 25 issue of the Washington Post.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 31, 1966]

THE HOLDING STRATEGY

(By Walter Lippmann)

Toward the end of the year we had arrived at a turning point in the Vietnamese war. There had to be new and great decisions about the strategy and objectives of the war The turning has been marked by a suspension of bombing in North Vietnam and by the President's worldwide diplomatic campaign to bring about a negotiated truce.

At the sametime, just as Congress was reassembling, Senator MANSFIELD published his report, which is the first official, responsible, and adequately informed account of the state of the war. The Mansfield report was followed by the first deep criticism of the strategy of the war on the part of a military man especially competent to judge it. The judgment came in a letter to Harper's magazine from Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, who was the Army's Chief of Plans and Operations at the time when the French were facing defeat at Dienbienphu.

There was also a movement of popular opinion, which is, I believe, just under the surface of what the polls report. It was precipitated by the proven failure of the strategical decisions taken last July. After all the bombing and the multiplication of our forces, the best that can be said is that out of the impending defeat of the Saigonese forces a year ago we have snatched not a victory, nor any credible prospect of victory, but a bloody and costly stalemate.

The President has three choices open to him. One is to expand the war by bombing Haiphong and Hanoi. But that opens up the possibility that the crowded harbor and city of Saigon will be bombed in return, and also that China, perhaps even the Soviet Union, will be drawn actively into the war. A second choice is to expand our ground forces for a big land war. The third choice is to concentrate the U.S. military forces along the coast, and, holding fast, try then to negotiate a truce.

UNDECIDED BASIC ISSUE

As I write this article, the President has made it reasonably clear that he is resisting the idea of a much bigger war. Thus, he has continued the pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. But the basic issue is not, it appears, decided. He has not yet adopted the strategy of restricting the American intervention to a holding operation in Saigon and along the coast.

If he does this, he will not be adopting a new idea. He will be adopting a strategy which was urged upon him last July before he escalated and Americanized the war and sent American troops out into the jungle to find and destroy the Vietcong. The President rejected the holding strategy last July. There is a strong case why he should now fall back upon it. For, as it was argued last July, the holding strategy enables us to honor our commitments to the South Vietnamese, who would be lost if we withdrew precipitately from the whole country. The holding strategy, moreover, relieves our troops of the impossible task of occupying the villages of South Vietnam and keeping the Vietcong from overrunning them when we leave. The holding strategy is built upon our seapower, which is our strong right arm, not upon the ability of American soldiers fighting 8,000 miles away to make secure 2,500 villages.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

The holding strategy is what General Gavin advocates, and it is now receiving wide support in the Congress and in the press. It would be, I have thought since last July, the best of a bad business, not glorious, but the least costly way of repairing the grievous mistakes of the past.

But we must not deceive ourselves about the probable political consequences. The adoption of the holding strategy would amount to an acknowledgment that the Vietcong have defeated the Saigonese forces in most of South Vietnam. It recognizes a de facto military partition of South Vietnam. If we are indeed committed, as some people say we are, to reconquer the whole of South Vietnam and to get rid of all of the Vietcong and to establish General Ky as the ruler of all South Vietnam, then in the holding strategy we would indeed renege on our commitments.

The question is whether the American Government under any of the three Presidents who have dealt with South Vietnam ever made such an absurd, such a fantastically unreal, commitment. I do not think so, and if someone turned up a piece of paper signed by John Foster Dulles or Dean Rusk, I would feel about it as I would if they had signed a piece of paper ceding Alaska to the Eskimos. An absurd and impossible commitment is not a true commitment in law or in morals, and a commitment to make General Ky the accepted ruler of South Vietnam is both absurd and impossible.

We can with a good conscience adopt a holding strategy. If it enables us eventually to disengage our military forces from the Asian mainland and to retire to the sea and the islands where our power is at its maximum, we shall have acted honorably, humanely, and wisely.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Jan. 25, 1966]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vietnam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

Draft Card Burners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 19, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a copy of a letter Mrs. Richard Shaffer, of Norwalk, Conn., wrote to President Johnson.

Mrs. Shaffer expresses a feeling that many of us have about the possibility of draft card burners and other similar types undermining the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam. I agree that it is important that our service men and women know we are solidly behind them. In the belief that Mrs. Shaffer's letter will be of interest to my colleagues, I am inserting it and a letter sent to our men in Vietnam in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letters follow:

To the Officers and Enlisted Men:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter written by me today to President Johnson. Never before have I felt so strongly that I would bother him with a letter from someone as plain and ordinary as me and I'm sure in the course of human events my letter is unimportant. But I can't think of a better way to let you know how so many millions of us feel.

Sincerely,

VIVIAN E. SHAFFER.

SHOREFRONT PARK,
Norwalk, Conn., December 10, 1965.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The publicity given to peace marches and draft-card burners is undermining the morale and spirit of our fighting forces in Vietnam and our service men and women around the world. The American forces have never been defeated and the only thing that will ever defeat them will be a complete breakdown in their morale and the inner spirit that helps to create the best trained, best equipped fighting force this world has ever known.

We know why our men are in Vietnam—our great freedom carries with it a grave responsibility, and they are carrying out our responsibility. The men know why they are there. But unless we, the plain ordinary people here at home, back them up with strong encouragement and make clear to them our appreciation and understanding for the job they are doing, they will surely be defeated, not by the enemy, but by their own broken morale caused by our seeming indifference.

We ask that you help us get the message to each fighting man this Christmas that there are millions of Americans at home backing up their efforts and their sacrifices in Vietnam. We are backing them and will continue to do so with hard work, sacrifice, and prayer. We will do whatever you ask of us to help reinforce the spirit so necessary to maintain each member of our forces.

If you take this opportunity to speak for all of us in a dramatic and forceful way, the headlines of your message and the radio and

TV coverage will wipe from the hearts and minds of these men any doubts that they might have about their mission and how we at home feel.

This country is indeed fortunate to have you for its President. Your steady hand, your wisdom and experience guide the freedom of this Nation and its people and give hope for the rest of the world. The same steady hand, wisdom, and experience is needed to remind us of the grave responsibility that goes with our freedom, for without an equal amount of responsibility our freedom cannot survive.

Please tell our fighting men that they are in our thoughts and prayers and will remain there until the job is done.

Respectfully,
VIVIAN E. SHAFFER
Mrs. Richard Shaffer.

Alder Springs Job Corps Dividends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, after 6 months of diligent efforts molding and remolding men in the Alder Springs Job Corps Camp in my congressional district, I am pleased to report the following direct appraisal of results: Ed Davis, of the Willows Daily Journal, on January 12 published the following:

CHANGE IS NOTED IN JOB CORPSMEN

ALDER SPRINGS.—Letters from parents—and, in one instance, a newspaper clipping—are giving heartening evidence that the Job Corps Center here is doing a job for its corpsmen; and that they are doing a job for themselves.

Parents have been quick to praise the changes they noted in their sons during the Christmas vacation, says Camp Director A. R. Groncki. "The mails have been bringing one heartwarming letter after another."

Especially noteworthy have been the comments, in a letter and in a Pennsylvania newspaper article, about John Lee of Berkeley and Steve Maust of Everett, Pa.

Lee's guardian, Mrs. Josephine Davis, expressed her gratitude in the following message received this week by Groncki:

"I can't find words to say how much you've done for John Lee.

"You have brought about such a change. I really can't say enough praise for you men for taking so much pain and worry with my boy, for he has shown a lot of improvement.

"Please continue the good work."

Lee readily admits that before he entered the Job Corps he had a penchant for getting into trouble:

"I used to be a follower," he said. "There wasn't anything else to do.

"When the gang got caught doing something wrong, I was with them and got blamed too.

"If I hadn't joined the Job Corps, I know I'd be in trouble now." Buckling down to the camp's work and study schedule, Lee has almost completed its basic math and reading programs.

He has been promoted to assistant leader and is working in the infirmary as an assistant to the camp's medic, Carl Buterbaugh, a retired Navy chief warrant officer.

Lee's ambition is to pursue his medical training further, either in the service or by getting a job as a hospital orderly, in order to become a qualified medic.

Steve Maust's change in attitude, and his warm feelings about the Job Corps camp, were reported in an interview with him by the Everett, Pa., Gazette.

The newspaper noted that Maust's father operates an Everett-area farm for its owner, and commented, referring to the youth:

"He wasn't much for working around the farm before he left last summer for the Job Corps camp. 'I guess I was at the age when I thought I didn't have to take orders.'

"The Gazette reporter found Maust helping his father by operating a tractor. The youth didn't think it detracted from the free time of his vacation from camp."

Maust, who dropped out of school in the eighth grade, has completed his basic math program at the camp, and has only three of eight reading levels to complete.

"They sure spend more time with us than they did in our school," he told the Gazette reporter.

"Most of us think it's an all-right camp. We want to learn, and the teachers are really good."

The 19-year-old youth is concentrating in his work schedule on learning how to weld and how to operate heavy equipment.

When he graduates from the camp, he wants to return home and get a skilled job which his training will have equipped him to handle.

Groncki recounts that the Alder Springs camp exerted perhaps the strongest influence on, of all people, a guy who had been "booted."

"It wasn't that he got into big trouble," Groncki said, "but after a continuing series of difficulties with the boy we sent him home to Chicago—we thought for good."

Came the end of the Christmas holiday period, and there at Alder Springs, bright as a button, was the youth waiting to sign in.

"I thought we sent you home," the amazed camp director exploded.

"You did," he replied.

"But I wanted to come back."

It turned out that somehow he had smuggled himself aboard a chartered plane bringing the eastern corpsmen back to the coast, smuggled himself aboard a highway bus and then the bus to camp, and there he was.

Groncki, forced to admire the boy's spunkness and determination, in spite of his highly irregular conduct, asked if he thought he might behave himself.

He said he did.

His reapplication is being submitted to Washington and, if he continues on good behavior, it looks as if he'll stay.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the life of every nation celebration of its day of independence is a joyous occasion. How proud and happy we in the United States are to commemorate each year the signing of our Declaration of Independence. But how sad it must be for Ukrainians the world over to know each January 22, their day of independence, that in their country there is no independence. Yet, January 22 is for them a proud day. In 1918 after 2½ centuries of foreign rule, an independent Ukraine was proclaimed. It was a daring act, an act for which the Ukrainians paid dearly in the ensuing 3 years. It has been 48 years since that day of Ukrainian independence in 1918. During those years nation after nation has become independent. The huge colonial empires are gone—except for that of the Soviet Union. Within that empire lies the Ukraine. Some day this great land north of the Black Sea may again be free, may again celebrate its independence day in freedom. We can do no less than work toward that end.

U.S. Housing Policies Have Done More Harm Than Good

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a valued and serious-minded constituent of mine recently called to my attention the front-page article in a recent issue of Barron's Business and Financial Weekly relating to our far-reaching and expensive housing programs.

Those of my colleagues who will take the time to read this article will find cause for some second thoughts about accelerating the programs to which we have been committed in the past.

The article follows:

U.S. HOUSING POLICIES HAVE DONE MORE HARM THAN GOOD

Fanaticism, in Santayana's words, consists in redoubling your effort when you have forgotten your aim. By this definition the President's state of the Union address, despite the matter-of-fact tone in which it was delivered and its frequent appeals to reason, eminently qualifies. Although over 10 million of his fellow Americans still were suffering physical and financial hardship at the hands of unbridled union power, the Chief Executive repeated his plea to strike down State right-to-work laws. Nearly 200,000 U.S. troops are facing a united Communist front in South Vietnam; nonetheless, the Commander in Chief recommended that Congress "build bridges" between East and West. Finally, heedless of a consistent record of failure, Mr. Johnson urged an expanded Federal effort in the realm of housing and home finance. "In some of our urban areas we must help rebuild entire sections and neighborhoods * * * I will offer other proposals to stimulate and to reward planning for the growth of entire metropolitan areas."

By taking his stand four-square in support of better shelter, Lyndon Johnson reaffirmed a pledge dating back to the depression, when FDR eloquently proclaimed that one-third of a nation was "ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed." Since then, housing has become the object of greater and more persistent Federal solicitude than anything but social security. Year after year Congress has passed sweeping multibillion-dollar laws designed to enhance the quantity and quality of American homes. In 1965 the administration succeeded in establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development, of which career official Robert C. Weaver last week was named head.

For its vast investment of time and money, Washington on the constructive side has remarkably little to show. Relative to the gross national product homebuilding in the postwar era has failed to match the peaks set in the palmy days of the twenties; since 1963, it has been in a slump. On the other hand, thanks largely to a perennial official bias toward easy credit, construction costs, which have far outrun other price indexes since World War II, continue their relentless climb. The same holds true of delinquencies and foreclosures. Inflated appraisals, loose mortgage practices and overextended borrowers and lenders have become less the exception than the rule. "We must change in order to master change," said President Johnson the other night. In housing and home finance, it's plainly time for a change.

What the Great Society promises, however, is more of the same. Though housing, as noted, has been far from neglected (FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages outstanding now exceed $70 billion), the Johnson administration last year pushed through Congress perhaps the most sweeping and costly measure of its kind. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 authorized outlays put at upwards of $8 billion for such purposes as urban renewal, public housing (including a controversial program of rent supplements) and subsidized private housing. In line with longstanding custom, it lowered FHA down payments by $500 or so, or to less than 10 percent on higher-priced homes, and set up a new program covering insurance of no-down-payment loans to veterans. The legislation, averred the Chief Executive when he signed it, "will take us many longer strides" nearer the desired goal: "the right of every family to a decent home."

If that's the goal, it remains as elusive as ever. Private nonfarm housing starts in 1965 slipped to an estimated 1.5 million, down 4 percent from 1964 and even more from 1963. Until recently, perennial optimists in and outside the trade were forecasting a recovery for 1966. However, according to the Wall Street Journal last week, builders and lenders alike now have lowered their sights. Despite everything the Government may do, they look for a further slide in housing starts. "I don't see how the homebuilding industry can hope to avoid a decline in the number of new units constructed this year," said the economist for the U.S. Savings & Loan League.

For the latest setback to their plans, builders tend to divide the blame between the war in Vietnam and the Federal Reserve. What ails homebuilding, however, goes deeper. Despite the proliferation of the Federal housing establishment, the number of private dwelling units started reached their postwar peak 15 years ago. In 1959 Dr. Emerson Schmidt, then director of economic research for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, testified that relative to total output of goods and services or to population, homebuilding since 1946 has failed to match the record of the twenties. The burgeoning influence of Government, it thus would appear, has yielded the Nation not more housing but less.

As a mounting weight of evidence suggests, far more serious distortions must be laid at Washington's door. One is the unbroken advance in residential construction costs, which, on the authoritative E. H. Boeckh index, have more than doubled since 1946, a climb exceeding that of the cost-of-living by over two-thirds. The rise in delinquencies and foreclosures, notably in homes financed by Federal Housing agencies, has been equally relentless. In the third quarter of last year, 29,000 home mortgages were foreclosed, 4 percent ahead of the like 1964 period (and twice as many as in recession-ridden 1960). Mounting defaults on FHA-insured multifamily home loans, which were running over 9 percent last summer, prompted a concerned letter from the White House to Robert C. Weaver, then HHFA Administrator; since then, such foreclosures have risen to nearly 10 percent. Scant wonder that losses on loan portfolios exceed all expectations. Last week Far Western Financial Corp. disclosed that a loss on the sale of foreclosed properties, coupled with a reserve against similar future losses, had more than wiped out last year's operating profit.

The heaviest toll cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Thanks in large measure to U.S. housing agencies, the national landscape has been strewn with small, often shoddy structures; which affront the eye no less than a billboard. For a generation cities have been defaced with thousands of public housing projects which HHFA officials now candidly label "high-rise ghettos." From the notorious "608" scandals of the late forties to the recent shocking disclosures of fraudulent mortgage valuations, the lure of easy credit—and easy money—has done its worst to corrupt builder, appraiser, mortgagor, and mortgagee. For the crack in the picture window—and in the industry's code of ethics—decades of misguided Government largess must share the blame.

"We can get on a bus labeled economic reform," so Prof. George J. Stigler has written, "but we don't know where it will take us." To judge by all the foregoing, those in the driver's seat have lost their way, and not merely in the murky realm of housing and home finance. In the circumstances, the rest of Professor Stigler's strictures are worth citing. "When we undertake a policy reform or improve some part of the economy, there is one way, and only one way, to find out whether we have succeeded—to look and see. We have not studied the experience of economic reform, and know not its successes nor its failures, its lessons on ways to proceed and ways to avoid." Before appropriating another $112.8 billion of the taxpayer's money, Congress would do well to pay heed.

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at the First Annual Public Affairs Conference, Atlanta, Ga., November 19, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. WELTNER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on November 19, 1965, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY spoke to 5,000 high school honor students in Atlanta, Ga. The occasion was the first annual public affairs conference, and his speech was a stirring declaration of the future responsibilities and challenges awaiting our young people. It is with great pleasure that I attach his speech to my remarks at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, FIRST ANNUAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS CONFERENCE, ATLANTA, GA., NOVEMBER 19, 1965

I always welcome the opportunity to speak to young people.

President Truman has often said that young people are the best audiences. They listen intently—weighing each word with a scholarly mixture of skepticism and objectivity—and then ask questions that make you wish you had stayed in Washington.

And he is right.

My pleasure is enhanced by meeting with you in Atlanta—this bustling, growing, active city * * * this city filled with a spirit of faith in itself and in the future.

This pause today with young people is truly the pause that refreshes.

A young friend of mine, who only a few years ago was also a high school student in a southern city, told me recently of the visit he made this summer to his college reunion.

He found his college to be, on the surface at least, unchanged.

The one change that caught his eye was the bulletin boards.

The bulletin boards were filled with evidence of concern and activity which had not existed only a few years before.

There were placards describing the life of a Peace Corps volunteer.

There were brochures explaining how students could devote several hours each week to working in the city's slums.

There were organizational brochures for students' political groups ranging across the whole spectrum of the American political scene.

And there were copies of letters from classmates or recent graduates who had spent their summer working for causes in which they believed—on an Indian reservation in Oklahoma, or a village in Peru, or a town in Mississippi.

My young friend believed, and I believe, that the symbol of your generation of Americans is the bulletin board—filled with evidence of concern and commitment which young people today feel, and understand, and act upon.

What is it that has motivated young people to be interested in and concerned about their country, their world, and their future?

Today let us examine some of the challenges ahead.

We are challenged first and foremost by the need to insure that history's mightiest instruments of destruction will never be used. We are challenged to pursue the cause of a just and enduring peace.

We are challenged by our need to comprehend and to master the wonders of science and technology.

Of all the scientists who ever lived in all the history of mankind, 95 percent are now living and working. We must channel scientific revolution toward the creation of a better life for ourselves and for our children.

We are challenged by the vision expressed by our President: "An America in which no young person, whatever the circumstances, shall reach the age of 21 without the health, education, and skills that will give him an opportunity to be an effective citizen and a self-supporting individual."

We are challenged to lift the yoke of poverty from one-fifth of our fellow citizens * * * to reverse that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

Nowhere is that equation more accurate, or its consequences more devasting, than in our own American Southland where almost one-half the families live below the poverty line.

What a burden this is on the South—in terms of welfare costs, of lost productivity, of stress on your society.

We are challenged to make our cities decent places in which to live and learn, to work and play.

And this is a challenge which means as much to you here in Atlanta as to any people in all the world—for Atlanta is a city which is still young enough to avoid the mistakes which have fouled the atmosphere and shattered the hopes of millions of urban dwellers across our land.

And, finally, we are challenged to make good the promise of our Constitution—to insure that all Americans shall, as citizens, have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

These, then, are the challenges. We as Americans can share a sense of pride in what we are doing to meet them. You know of the record of this remarkable 89th Congress.

This Congress has passed laws which build a base for our American future: laws for better education, better housing, better medical care, laws to extend opportunity to people and places bypassed by opportunity.

Most of those laws directly benefit the American younger generation, as well they should.

But, as the late President Kennedy so often said, "You must ask not what your country can do for you—you must ask what you can do for your country."

Atlanta's great editor, Ralph McGill, recently wrote: "Today's generation of young people is our best. It is better educated, more poised, possesses superior information, and is in general more determined to commit itself to beliefs and principle."

He was right. Here and in the world, young men and women are showing what this generation of Americans can do:

More than 10,000 young volunteers—including 62 from the State of Georgia—are now serving in the Peace Corps. Another 3,000 have already returned after tours of duty. But most significant, more than 100,000 have asked to take part in the bold and imaginative experiment.

When VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America—the domestic Peace Corps) was launched, more than 3,000 inquiries were received from young people on the first day of business.

No fewer than one-quarter of the members of our armed services are under 20 years old.

Specifically, what can you do for your community and your country?

You can, first of all, stay in school and finish school.

The young person who does not educate himself to the limit of his ability dissipates his most precious possession.

Unemployment among younger workers is already three times as high as among older workers.

A diploma is the key to a job. Without it you may find the door of opportunity locked.

You will hear that success is simply a matter of being in the right place at the right time—or of knowing the right people. Do not believe it.

As Louis Pasteur said, "Chance favors the prepared mind."

You make your opportunities.

Today—as you never will again—you have a priceless chance to prepare your mind, to seize opportunity.

You can be aware of what is happening in the world—and this public affairs conference is a tribute not only to the foresight of your teachers and principals but also to your own interest in what is happening around you. And as you enhance your awareness of the great issues of our time, exercise your precious right to vote.

More than half the electorate today is under 35. By next year half of the population will be under 25 years of age. Work and vote for the candidates and the party you believe in. Improve the quality of politics.

You should give serious consideration to the opportunities for service which can be afforded best by public office. I do not mean to imply that only through elective or appointive office can you make your contribution to our progress as a civilization. As Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "Every calling is great when greatly pursued."

For American business, labor and agriculture need the vitality, the idealism and the dedication of young men and women. They welcome the spirit of adventure, and enterprise so characteristic of youth.

Holmes also said, "As life is action and passion, it is required of a man that he should share the passion and action of his time, at peril of being judged not to have lived."

No State offers a better example of the opportunities for young people in public service than your own Georgia. For this is the State that produced RICHARD RUSSELL—elected Governor of Georgia at 34, the youngest Member of the U.S. Senate at 35, as was HERMAN TALMADGE later. This is the State that produced your young Governor Sanders. This is the State which produced such farseeing men as Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Walter George, Carl Vinson, and Gen. Lucius Clay, who entered public life as young men.

There is a proud tradition of service in Georgia—and you would do well to turn your thoughts toward a role in carrying forward that tradition.

Finally, you should not put off until middle age those tasks which call for the zest and vigor of youth.

The story is told that Pericles of ancient Greece in his later years came across a young lawyer of Athens who was deeply involved in public affairs.

Pericles chastised the young man for being too bold and too brash—for concerning himself with things better left to older men.

Pericles said: "Of course, I understand, for I, too, was overeager in my youth. But now that I am older I have learned better. Take my advice and do not become so involved."

To which the young man replied: "I regret I did not have the privilege of knowing you when you were at your best."

In the years immediately ahead you will be at your best. So do become involved—for only by becoming involved in the needs and aspirations of others, can you truly satisfy your own inner needs and aspirations. And I hope you will become involved right here in your own community.

It was after the Civil War that Atlanta became the symbol of the new South. Rising like a phoenix from the ashes of that tragic war, Atlanta—under the Constitution's editor Henry Grady and others—came to epitomize the spirit of that new South.

Atlantans took bold action, recognizing the urgent need to reestablish relationships with the rest of the Nation, to restore business, to build a more stable future for young people.

Today, as then, Atlanta symbolizes the new South. This is a city on the move—and America knows it.

In your hands lies Atlanta's future, and the future of America.

Here in the South there lies before you the immediate task of extending opportunity and defeating poverty—of building a society equal and not separate.

And in this task you are joined by your President and the citizens of this Nation—a Nation unified in its belief that all people and places in America shall be full partners in our American tomorrow.

All of us bear responsibility for those left behind. It is the fault of no one section of the country, or political party.

And all of us bear responsibility for righting past wrongs, for practicing what we preach in this country.

In America today we seek to create a great society: a society of opportunity, and justice, and human dignity where each child can step forth into life with his eyes up and on the stars.

You young people, coming of age in this community, have the chance to make this dream come true.

I know of no place on earth where men more love their country than in the South.

More than once have I heard one of my colleagues in the U.S. Senate say: "I love the South."

And he has meant: I love the soil, I love my family, I love the people, I love the spirit of the place that bore me. I love a sense of duty and responsibility. I love men and women who hold their heads high in adversity and face tomorrow with determination. I love my country.

It is in this spirit that I charge you with responsibility for tomorrow.

May you work toward the goal expressed a generation ago by the author Thomas Wolfe:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this is the promise of America."

Remarks of Charles S. Murphy, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Before the Association of Local Transport Airlines, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the address of the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, distinguished Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, which he delivered before the Association of Local Transport Airlines at Houston, Tex., on November 5, 1965.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CHARLES S. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, BEFORE THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL TRANSPORT AIRLINES, FALL QUARTERLY REGIONAL MEETING AT HOUSTON, TEX., NOVEMBER 5, 1965

I understand it has been the custom for board members meeting with Association of Local Transport Airlines to note some of your success in your business; and also to speak frankly about some of the problems in whose solutions we have a mutual interest. I shall not depart from that custom. I also make the cutomary disclaimer that my statements do not necessarily represent the views of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I saw in the trade press several days ago that your top item of discussion here would be strengthening of the local service airlines route pattern. I saw that you were also going to talk about class mail rate No. IV and the "CAB staff" position on surcharges.

You may have exhausted all these subjects already, but I will run the risk of adding a few more observations, in case you are interested in my point of view—which may be somewhat different from yours. I might also toss into the list of topics a few more—like new flight equipment, and carrier earnings, and public service.

This is a tough set of problems. They are all so closely tied together—the handling of one depends so much on what happens with respect to the others—that it is not only difficult to sort them out for the purpose of dealing with them, it's even difficult to know where to start talking about them.

I don't mean to suggest that the picture is all dark. Indeed, your increasingly successful experience of the last few years is bright and shining proof to the contrary. I do mean to say that the economics of the local service air carrier industry are tough. For you to operate your carriers successfully is a difficult and challenging task. The fact that you have succeeded as well as you have is a tribute to your skill, your ingenuity, your business acumen—and not least of all your tenacity. For all this, I salute you.

Just 5 years ago the total local service carrier investment added up to only $57.7 million; and overall rate of return earned on that investment was only 5.81 percent. By way of contrast, on June 30, 1965, your investment had grown to $122.3 million, and reported earnings before interest deductions were more than $15.8 million, a rate of 12.97 percent on investment. This has been a healthy development. It has permitted you to make the necessary investment for improved flight equipment. It has enabled you to upgrade salaries so that you can compete, on somewhat more equal terms, for capable executives and employees. And it has contributed to almost a threefold increase in the average price of local service carriers' stocks which are publicly traded.

Service too has increased, its quality has improved—and traffic has responded. In 1962 there were 79 cities that received less than two round trips daily, and 120 that generated less than five passengers daily. As of June 30, 1965, there were only 58 cities receiving less than two daily round trips, and only 60 which generated less than 5 passengers. The number of city pairs that averaged less than 7 passengers on board per aircraft mile decreased from 214 in 1962 to 140 in calendar 1964, and is expected to show further decrease in 1965.

In 1960, 70 percent of all local service was eprformed in that heroic workhorse, the DC–3; in 1965, 73 percent of all local service was provided in more modern aircraft. The first local carrier has now introduced pure jet equipment into service, and, of the remaining carriers, all but three have introduced turbo-prop equipment. And much additional modern equipment is scheduled for early delivery.

All who participated in the effort that has made possible these advances—the industry people, the congressional leaders who have interested themselves in aviation and the CAB and its staff—have the right to be proud of all this.

As a recent arrival at the CAB, let me tell you that in my long experience in Government I have never enjoyed personal associations more thoroughly than with my fellow Board members, and never have I had an opportunity of working with more able or dedicated staff.

As you know, we have recently regrouped some of the staff in a new Bureau of Economics. We hope that this will enable the Board to use its staff more effectively.

We intend to place more emphasis on planning, programing, and research to help us deal with the increasingly complex problems of air transportation. We also believe that the Board can profitably place a greater emphasis on its promotional responsibilities in the coming months and years. The staff reorganization is intended to assist in this objective.

Certainly no segment of the industry stands to benefit more than you from an increased emphasis on the Board's promotional responsibilities. There is almost no area in which we could stimulate the use of air service in which you would not receive some beneficial fallout.

Your "Visit USA" tariff for foreign visitors has demonstrated your ability to contribute useful promotional ideas. This tariff is of particular interest to the administration in connection with its program to encourage travel to and within the United States. We expect you to continue the same type of creative action in the coming months. We need the benefit of your experience and insight for greater progress. We want your thoughts and ideas on how other industry segments can contribute to growth and service, as well as ideas relating to your own immediate interests and service. If we are to take full advantage of the expanded opportunities which our great national prosperity has made available, we need the constructive suggestions of everyone. We especially want your help in developing additional ways in which to fill some of the empty seats in the planes our carriers are flying.

I should like now to return to a more particular discussion of our local service problems.

First, as to route strengthening. I sometimes hear it said that a particular route should not be awarded to a local service carrier because the carrier wants it to satisfy its ambitions for expansion. To me, this is not a good kind of a reason for withholding a route. There's nothing wrong with wanting something. If a person wants something, that's one reason in and of itself to give it to him. When someone asks me for something, I'd rather be able to say "Yes" than have to say "No". Neither is there anything wrong with having ambitions. In fact, in the business you're in you need ambitions—along with a considerable amount of optimism—to spur you on toward a solution of your problems. Nor is there anything wrong per se with expansion. In fact, as I see it, one of the best hopes for strengthening local service carriers, and reducing Government subsidy, is through route expansion.

Fortunately, changing conditions such as growth in traffic and the availability of new types of aircraft may well present new opportunities for route strengthening which simply did not exist before.

Let me hasten to add that this route expansion has to be a highly selective process. There are good route expansions and bad route expansions. I'm in favor of the good ones and against the bad ones. Each has to be examined on its merits—carefully but not necessarily interminably—and decided on the basis of the facts in the particular case.

Without undertaking to mention all the criteria for determining whether a particular route expansion is good or bad, let me say that among the factors which seem to me to be important are the effect on service to the traveling public, the effect on Government subsidy, the effect on the earnings of the carrier seeking the expansion, and the effect on other carriers. It is not always certain that a new route sought by a carrier will be a profitable route. I believe the CAB does have a responsibility to share in the decision as to whether a subsidized carrier should be allowed to take on a route that may be unprofitable. However, in this kind of decision I tend toward more rather than less freedom of choice by air carrier management—particularly where the carrier is willing to assume the primary risk by taking the route on a nonsubsidy basis.

It appears that there are significant opportunities for strengthening your routes without undue risk to the welfare of our trunkline industry. Among the top 300 domestic markets, there are 101 markets under 300 miles in distance. These are markets for which your equipment and experience would appear especially adapted. Yet the total traffic in these 101 markets is less than 6 percent of the trunkline revenue passenger miles.

In 1964, the local service carriers carried more than 25 percent of the passengers in only 27 of these markets and in 47 markets they carried less than 10 percent of the traffic. In 58 of the 101 markets, the local carriers have route restrictions which adversely affect their opportunity to serve. Of course, I recognize that each market must be separately appraised, both as to its ability to support economically the service you may propose, as well as the impact of that service on the carriers already in the market.

One kind of danger we must guard against is the development of local service carriers in such a way that they neglect service to the smaller towns and cities—the very purpose for which they were created. This word of caution is applicable with respect to new flight equipment as well as route structures. The use of better aircraft is good, and I applaud it. They provide better service for the public and can provide better earnings for the carriers where properly adapted. I have been pleased that, in the various presentations of your reequipment plans made to us, you have all stressed your ability to operate this equipment over your present routes with decreased subsidy need.

There is now some evidence that the change to better equipment actually generates substantial new passenger traffic for local carriers. This is wonderful. There is every reason to hope the transition to jet and prop jet equipment will greatly strengthen your industry. At the same time, it is most important for you to exercise the greatest care to get the kind of equipment that is best suited for the job you are supposed to do. To me this means selectivity in matching types of equipment with particular types of routes. This is a matter which I believe the Board should and will take into account in fixing subsidy rates. We don't propose to forget the small towns, and we don't want you to. On the other hand, I don't think we should pay for flight equipment of a kind that is grossly in excess of the needs of these small towns, and I don't believe you would expect us to.

To return to your route structures, I suppose it is obvious that one way in which they could be made more profitable would be by eliminating loss points that you serve. This raises the question of the public interest in providing service to such points—and under the law I believe it is the responsibility of the CAB on a case by case basis to balance the public benefit against the public cost. Since you are profit-motivated institutions, and very properly so, we cannot expect you to conduct your total operation at a loss—at least, not intentionally. We might ask you to take some of the lean along with the fat, if there's enough fat. I hope there will be more fat as time goes on. But frankly, I doubt if your route systems will ever be as strong as the route systems of the trunk carriers, and I believe that, apart from questions of fairness and equity, this raises questions as to the extent of your ability to cross-subsidize service to loss points.

This impels me toward the view that we should seek to differentiate more clearly between the routes where you can reasonably expect to make a profit and those where a subsidy is necessary. If we don't recognize the difference between these two situations, we might end up with the wrong kind of treatment for both.

This brings us to class mail rate No. IV. It is generally agreed the class rates have been an improvement over the earlier systems. I fully share that view. But as we gain more experience, and as conditions change, we must continue to seek improvements in the class rate. We are now in the midst of a major effort of that kind. Our target date for its effectiveness is January 1, 1966.

You have been good enough to provide us with a great deal of information that is useful and is being used for this purpose. We are studying it diligently.

From the beginning, the class rate has been designed to give the industry a fair opportunity for profit; to encourage management efficiency; and to permit the industry to attract necessary capital.

No one thought that the class rate No. 1 was perfect. But it did end the cycle of cost-plus ratemaking, or as some described it, cost-minus ratemaking. There have since been two modifications of the rate formula. Each of the previous rates adopted by the Board was designed to meet the economic needs of each carrier's system as a whole. Each carrier's system consists of a conglomeration of routes ranging from those which are commercially self-sufficient to those which require a varying degree of public assistance. It has, therefore, been necessary to modify the formula in an effort to have the subsidy follow the economic need, rather than have payment made indiscriminately for profitable as well as unprofitable services. However, on a carrier system basis, it is possible to do this effectively only to a limited degree.

The board has, therefore, adopted many devices to protect the public against unnecessary subsidy payments. There is the profit-sharing formula under the class rate; the ad hoc rate adjustment, and the subsidy-ineligible certificate condition where a new service appears capable of self-supporting operations. These devices have helped, but they do have shortcomings.

The profit-sharing device has obvious negative incentives for business efficiency. The ad hoc rate adjustment lasts only for the lifetime of the particular rate. It is wiped out, as if it has never existed, by the adoption of the succeeding class rate. The subsidy, ineligible certificate is good and effective, as far as it goes. But it does not cover comparable routes—capable of self-sufficiency—on which service was inaugurated either at a point in time when their potential profitability was not apparent, or prior to the adoption of the policy of attaching such conditions to carriers' certificates.

I believe that most of you recognize the limitations of a class rate tied to the operations of a carrier's system. Surely you are anxious to have an opportunity to operate in a more normal commercial environment where success will flow from your ability to maximize your commercial revenues and minimize your expenses. You have great respect as I do, for the value of the profit system to secure economic and efficient operations. I am concerned, as I am sure that many of you are, about the long continuation of any system, in which there can be a question as to whether a service is being provided, or being discontinued, more because of its impact on subsidy payment than because of its market success or its public benefit. I do not doubt that we would both rather have the rules so shaped as to assure that an executive would be judged on how well he runs his airline rather than on his "class ratesmanship."

The need for a change in the class rate moving toward a segment basis has been apparent for some time. It is an admittedly difficult technical task to accomplish. But it is just as important a goal now as was the adoption of the original class rate. Accordingly, we must not wait for perfection, but should attempt to get the best result that we can in the immediate future.

Now just a word about the "CAB staff" position on jet surcharges. I shall not dwell on this because I talked about fares at some length in Miami last night, and the text of that talk will be available to you.

I do want to say that the current CAB position in this matter is a Board position, not a staff position. We are getting most competent technical assistance from our staff, but the reality is that the Board itself is determining its current policy on fares in fact as well as in theory. The policy may be right or it may be wrong, but we're the ones who are setting it.

Perhaps I should say that in the broader sense the Congress has determined the policy on fares in the Federal Aviation Act, and we are undertaking to carry out the mandate of Congress to the best of our ability. The law requires us, in fixing rates, to consider the need of the public for transportation at the lowest cost consistent with furnishing the service. I believe that provision of law has some applicability to the passenger fares of subsidized as well as nonsubsidized carriers. I'm sure you would not expect us to ignore this responsibility.

In conclusion, I wish to salute you again for your accomplishments. You have come far—I am sure you will go much further—better airlines, better airplanes, better profits, better public service.

The path toward progress is one which you and the CAB will necessarily have to tread, or fly, together. Your part of the job will be the larger part, but our part is also indispensible. We are conscious of our obligations to you, as well as our obligations to the Government and the public. We pledge you our best efforts.

There is going to be a lot of arithmetic done in the CAB, on your problems in the months ahead.

Fortunately, the liaison between your carriers and the CAB seems to be very good. We enjoy our personal associations with you and we feel that our channels of communication are good. I hope it will remain so.

We must recognize that although you and we have common goals, we have different responsibilities and from time to time are certain to have different points of view about how to pursue our goals. I'm sure we will both do our best according to our own lights.

I am reminded of the Catholic priest and the Methodist minister who had become good personal friends. One day, at the end of a long and pleasant conversation, the priest rose from his chair and said: "Well, John, I have enjoyed this. But now we should both get on with the Lord's work—you in your way, and I in His."

F. Edward Hébert: Dynamic Legislator Completes Quarter Century of Service in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, a full-length portrait of our colleague, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, was unveiled on January 3 at the Louisiana State Museum. The unveiling took place at precisely 1 minute after noon on January 3 at the moment when Mr. HÉBERT completed a quarter century of service in the House of Representatives. I congratulate the First District of Louisiana for choosing such a Representative, I congratulate the museum on this splendid commemoration, and I congratulate the artist, John Clay Parker, on getting EDWARD HÉBERT to stand still that long.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT has not stood still very often. He is a restless, driving man, a mover, a man who has to be doing things. Any one of several of Mr. HÉBERT's notable achievements would be career enough for most successful men. He was a great reporter, a great city editor and perhaps the most outstanding congressional investigator of his time. In 1933, when a sergeant named Batista overthrew the Government of Cuba, the first reporter to interview him was F. EDWARD HÉBERT. In 1939, the New Orleans States broke one of the legendary scoops of our time, the "Louisiana Scandals" story which won the paper the Sigma Delta Chi Award for courage in journalism. The city editor who directed coverage of that story was F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

Since coming to Congress, he has carved a singular reputation as an investigator, a legislator, and an orator.

As a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he took part in the famous Hiss-Chambers hearings in 1948 and Whitaker Chambers later referred to him as "the most unsparing of interrogators." As chairman of the Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee, he directed investigations which recovered millions of dollars in overcharges on defense contracts and untold millions more of the taxpayers' money have been saved because of reforms he forced in military procurement procedures. As an orator, he displays a command of the language matched by very few of all the men who have tread these Halls. His stamp and his influence are reflected in a great deal of important legislation passed by the Armed Services Committee in the past decade.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT is the first man in Louisiana history to serve 25 consecutive years in the House. He long since established the longevity for his own district. In fact, he has served more than twice as long as all but one of his predecessors. Of the 84 men who entered Congress in 1941, only 1 other besides Mr. HÉBERT has served consecutively to this very hour. That other man ought to have a pretty good appreciation of the talents and character of F. EDWARD HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am that other man and I do have an appreciation. A public man deserves to be judged on the record of his achievements. If he is also a man of warmth and humor, capable of deep friendship and unchanged by the wine of greatness, that is a bonus that we do not always have a right to expect. In the case of F. EDWARD HÉBERT we have the bonus. One could not have a finer friend and there are few men who are called friend by more people. He is one who, in the words of Kipling, "can talk with crowds and keep your virtue, or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch." EDWARD HÉBERT has never lost the common touch.

The commemorative ceremony included a very moving address by Hugh M. Wilkinson, president of the Louisiana Historical Society, and a special prayer by the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, Archbishop of New Orleans. I would like to place both of these in the RECORD. I also place in the RECORD a list of the men who have represented the First Congressional District of Louisiana in the U.S. Congress since 1805:

PRAYER BY THE MOST REVEREND PHILIP M. HANNAN, ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS

Almighty and eternal God, at the beginning of a new year, we beg you, in your infinite goodness to bless our guest of honor and all of us to your service and to the pursuance of our country's good. We beg that our hopes for peace with justice and freedom so recently kindled, may not be frustrated, but may rather be realized through your almighty power. May our country, through your grace, ever champion the cause of freedom, justice, righteousness and charity, and may we ever uphold the dignity of man both at home and among the nations of the world.

On this solemn occasion we thank you for the 25 years of distinguished service by the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT in the Congress of the United States to the cause of our country; we pray that you may bless him and his family and those who are devoted to him; and we ask that he may enjoy your special graces in his future service to our country—and to our community.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Address of Hugh M. Wilkinson, President, Louisiana Historical Society

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, and other distinguished guests, Congressman and Mrs. Hébert, Mrs. Duhe, ladies and gentlemen, each of us will recollect, I am sure, the familiar verse by the poet, Longfellow (and an occasion such as this brings it very forcibly to memory):

"Lives of great men men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

When he penned this metaphorical deduction, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow must also have been impressed with the extreme and dismaying fleetness of fame. Sand, shifting with every caprice of the winds, washed out by each flooding tide, could scarcely supply permanency to a reminder of greatness.

Since the dawn of civilization, however, mankind has succeeded in achieving more enduring means of preserving memories of a nation's greatness and the men who made it great, its heroes, its statesmen, its philosophers, its leaders in the arts and sciences. Chisels of sculptors have bequeathed to us in everlasting bronze and marble, and brushes of painters have given us in almost equally durable pigments laid upon canvas, the likenesses of the immortals of almost every age and clime. Centuries after a famous personage has passed from life's stage—whether he be among the ancients or the moderns—his bust or portrait, or perhaps both, is handed on to posterity as a perpetual reminder of who and what he was and the example of the inspiring life for which his name and reputation stand.

Today we are gathered in this building—itself a monument of Louisiana's fascinating colonial past—to mark a very important date in the career of a great Louisianian of the present era—one of the very greatest, I do not hesitate to affirm, of his day and time; to furnish him, by our presence, a testimonial of respect, admiration, esteem, and even our deep affection; and to be witnesses to the unveiling and first public viewing of such a re-creation, full length, on a painter's easel, of his features and figure as we know them so well, a portrait from a master artist's brush, and one upon which men, women, and children, for generations and generations to come, may look and be pridefully reminded that the subject of this portraiture is one of the truly great statesmen, not only of Louisiana, but the entire constitutional Republic of these United States of America.

Let it be well spoken of him, my friends, as we may paraphrase the lines of the poet Byron:

"His are deeds which should not pass away,
And his a name that must not wither."

Twenty-five years ago, almost to this hour, on Friday, January 3, 1941, at the opening of the 1st session of the 77th Congress and in the Hall of the House of Representatives in the Capitol at Washington, D.C., Felix Edward Hébert, native-born New Orleanian, then 39 years of age, was for the first time administered the oath of office as Representative from the First Congressional District of Louisiana, and there and then he solemnly swore to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

In the 25 consecutive years of his congressional service that have followed since that oath by him was first taken, it is our sincere belief, founded upon close observation, that no member of the Federal Government has kept that oath more sincerely, more conscientiously unselfishly, more honorably and with a greater degree of scrupulous fidelity, realistic understanding and effective ability in the discharge of his legislative duties than Eddie Hébert.

"Man and his littleness perish,
Erased like an error, and canceled;
Man and his greatness survive,
Lost in the greatness of God."

A number of records have been established by Eddie Hébert's survival, physically and politically, for a tenure of a quarter century in the Congress. Although in my humble opinion, his most distinguished record has been made, not by the length, but in the quality of his service to his district, his State, and to the Nation, the other records deserve a passing mention; and the most pertinently important of these, of course, is the fact that he has faithfully represented the people of his district, embracing the population of the lower half of New Orleans and the parishes of St. Bernard and Plaquemines, for a longer period of time than any of his predecessors in the office—an illustrious line, it may be remarked, which was started with Daniel Clark 160 years ago, as territorial representative in 1806.

And it may justifiably be interpolated here that, despite his independence of action, his refusal to zestfully play the game of partisan politics, his unswerving adherence to principle rather than a surrender ever to expediency, in the 13 times Hébert has gone before the people of his district in an election, serious opposition to his candidacy never has been mustered, nor has he ever suffered even a close decision in the results at the polls. And that, my friends, is a record of trust and confidence by a constituency unsurpassed in the history of this State.

Of 84 new Members who entered Congress with Hébert on January 3, 1941, only 2 remain today with uninterrupted service, himself and his close friend and congressional ally in many undertakings, Mendel Rivers of Charleston, S.C.

He has served under five Presidents—and that of itself is a record. He went in under the next to the last term of Franklin Roosevelt, who, of course, has been succeeded, in order, by Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and now President Johnson.

He has served during what history may come in time to record as the most frantically moving period of our national life—more pressing even upon a legislator than the years of the 18th century which witnessed the formation of the Republic, or the tragic era of the 19th century which saw the fratricidal strife of the Civil War. Within the first 12-months of Hébert's service, the day of infamy at Pearl Harbor occurred, and the United States was plunged into World War II. The dawn of the atomic age came with the first use of the A-bomb at Hiroshima, bringing about the termination of the Japanese war. The experiment of the United Nations began with its charter in 1945, suggesting a new and even a very questionable problem of national legislative service; and the so-called United Nations police action in Korea followed, putting our country back again into what was, after all, a bitter and bloody war, just as we are now experiencing its parallel of the conflict in Vietnam. In his time as a Congressman, Hébert has participated in the admission of 2 new States, Alaska and Hawaii—admissions to statehood which had not happened for approximately 30 years before he went to the Congress, or since the admission of New Mexico and Arizona in 1912.

Now Congressman Hébert is witnessing at close range and participating legislatively in the beginning of the conquest of outer space, with all its individual heroisms and the technological accomplishments which stagger one's imagination and even belittle the supposed imaginings of science fiction of only a generation ago. In these and other developments of international and even interplanetary scope, and in the very recent and revolutionary and often violent changes in social and political life in America, no Member of Congress, since the Nation began nearly two centuries ago, has faced any greater challenge to ability, industry, enterprise, and patriotism than did Eddie Hébert in his incumbency since 1941.

Time does not permit me to catalog his many notable accomplishments in Congress; but, in war and in peace during that 25 years—like the Father of our Country—Hébert has always been foremost in the esteem of the people of this portion of Louisiana, and deservedly so.

Samuel Johnson referred somewhere to what he called the salutary influence of example. George Chapman is quoted as expressing it:

"So our lives, in acts examplary,
Not only win ourselves good name,
But doth to others give
Matter by virtuous deeds
By which we live."

The example to the youth of the land which Eddie Hébert has set, by his quarter century of public service, is the consequence of a task to which he came well equipped and dedicated.

First by an honorable lineage, descending from families of the Héberts and the Naquins, tracing back to the early history of Louisiana as a French colony.

Secondly, by the teachings of his parents, particularly his devoted mother, Mrs. Lea Naquin Hébert, who was perhaps to take the greatest pride in his election to Congress in 1940.

Thirdly, by the closeness of affection which exists in his little family; his wife, Gladys, a real helpmate in his often burdensome official life, and his lovely daughter and only child, Dawn Marie, now Mrs. John Malcolm Duhe, Jr., of New Iberia. Today, we also have the beautiful spectacle of Eddie's four little grandchildren, sitting with him and Gladys, and I dare say this splendid ceremony in honor of their grandfather is something they will remember with pride for the rest of their lives.

Fourthly, by a profound sense of religious duty, nurtured in an educational institution—to judge by his frequent recollections of it—the Jesuits High School of New Orleans and its faculty, of whose members I have heard him so often speak.

Fifthly, by years of training, before he entered political life, as a New Orleans newspaperman: reporter, columnist, and editor—a rigorous indoctrination in the ethics of journalism which no doubt concrete-set on his conscience the rules of conduct he has since followed in public life.

And lastly, but not least, by an innate instinct to seek the truth, and to follow the path of righteousness, which has always governed Eddie Hébert's thoughts and deeds in personal as well as public life.

"No beggar ever felt him condescend, no Prince presume,
For still himself he bare at manhood's simple level,
And where e're he met a stranger,
There he left a friend."

And Eddie Hébert's friends are legion, as this gathering, in inclement weather this day, so well attests.

Disraeli once remarked that "the world is wearied of statesmen whom democracy has degraded into politicians." The great British prime minister would never have had to be concerned about the genuineness of Hébert's loyalty to the public service. To Hébert the virtue has always been in the struggle, not the prize. His accumulation of this world's goods is modest, because he has never sacrificed principle to selfish advantage. Politically, he has never worn any man's collar, nor even any faction's badge which he could not readily put aside when his country's best interest so required.

In short and in conclusion, I consider F. Edward Hébert the closest example of, and exponent of, real statesmanship and genuine patriotism whom the Congress of the United States has afforded in the last 25 years. In the hands of men such as he, we can rely that the Constitution and the Nation always will be safe against communism and every other peril of this exceedingly perilous age.

Therefore, today I take a very great pride in having this honor, this priviledge and this opportunity to make the presentation, in effort to posterity, of this portrait, in order that it may serve as an enduring reminder to future generations of the memory of a truly great Louisianian and a great American.

F. Edward Hébert: Newspaperman—Congressman

Born October 12, 1901. Son of Lea Naquin and Felix J. Hébert; husband of Gladys Bofill, father of Dawn Marie (Mrs. John Malcolm Duhe, Jr.), grandfather of Kim Marie, Jeanne Louise, Edward Malcolm, and Martin Bofill Duhe.

Entered the U.E. House of Representatives on January 3, 1941, as a Member of Congress from the First Congressional District of Louisiana. On January 3, 1966, became the first individual in the history of the State of Louisiana to serve for 25 consecutive years, a quarter of a century, in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The Portrait

(By John Clay Parker)

In this life-size portrait I have attempted to vividly capture the personality and character of Congressman Hébert and have surrounded him with the most important symbols of his colorful life and career.

To the right in the background is the U.S. Capitol in Washington where Congressman Hébert began his service in 1941. In the lower right-hand corner is a world globe bringing to mind his world travels as a member of the Armed Services Committee. At the upper left are the three flags under which the Congressman serves—the American, the State of Louisiana, and the city of New Orleans.

On the desk are the gavel, symbol of authority as chairman over the many committees in Congress which he had headed; the cannon symbolic of his close association with the armed services in peace and war; the quill recalling Congressman Hébert's writings as a reporter and newspaperman and finally the bust of the Greek orator Demosthenes suggesting Congressman Hébert's reputation as a forceful and dynamic orator and speaker.

The book being held by Congressman Hébert is a copy of "I Went, I Saw, I Heard" which he wrote upon his return from wartorn Europe in 1945. The Cathedral of Rheims is easily discernible on the back cover. The Hébert coat of arms can easily be seen engraved on the ring which he is wearing and which was a gift to him at a testimonial dinner in 1962 and which is inscribed "To F. Edward Hébert from a grateful people."

The size of the canvas is 88 inches by 52 inches exclusive of the goldleaf frame.

The Men of the First

Here are the man who have represented the First Congressional District of Louisiana in the U.S. Congress:

Daniel Clark (territorial representative), 1805–09.

Julien de Lallande Poydras (territorial representative), 1809–11.

Vacant: Senators Allen Bowie Magruder and Eligius Fromentin accorded privileges of House floor, 1811–13.

Thomas Bolling Robertson, 1813–18.

Thomas Butler, 1818–21.

Josiah Stoddard Johnston, 1821–23.

Edward Livingston, 1823–29.

Edward Douglass White, 1829–34.

Henry Johnson, 1834–39.

Edward Douglass White, 1839–43.

John Slidell, 1843–45.

Emile La Sere, 1846–51.

Louis St. Martin, 1851–53.

William Dunbar, 1853–55.

George Eustis, Jr., 1855–59.

John Edward Bouligny, 1859–61.

Benjamin Franklin Flanders seated in 1863 by wartime resolution, 1861–63.

Vacant; credentials presented by M. F. Bonzano, A. P. Field, W. D. Mann, T. M. Welles, and Robert W. Taliaferro but their claims were not finally disposed of, 1863–65.

Vacant; credentials presented by Jacob Barker, Robert C. Wickliffe, Louis St. Martin, John E. King, and John Ray and referred to the committee on reconstruction; no further action taken, 1865–67.

Jacob Hale Sypher, 1867–75.

Effingham Lawrence, 1875.

Randall Lee Gibson, 1875–83.

Carleton Hunt, 1883–85.

Louis St. Martin, 1885–87.

Theodore Stark Wilkinson, 1887–91.

Adolph Meyer, 1891–1908.

Albert Estopinal, 1908–19.

James O'Connor, 1919–31.

Joachim Octave Fernandez, 1931–41.

F. Edward Hébert, 1941 to date.

Address by Senator Len B. Jordan at Idaho Reclamation Association Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on December 13, 1965, Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho, spoke to the annual convention of the Idaho Reclamation Association" on the subject of water resources.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Jordan is one of the most knowledgeable men in the Pacific Northwest on this subject. As Governor of Idaho for 4 years he was very active in the formation of the Columbia River Compact Commission, which seeks to guarantee water for present and future needs for the participating States. He was cited by the other member States of the Columbia Basin for his outstanding achievements in this regard.

After completing his term as Governor, he was called to Washington, D.C., to act as chairman of the three-member U.S. delegation of the International Joint Commission, formed to work out water problems with our friends and neighbors to the north, the Canadians.

So it is that, when Senator Len Jordan speaks of water and water problems, he speaks with authority. His talk of December 13 is a keenly perceptive analysis of current and future water problems in the Pacific Northwest. I commend it to my colleagues.

Remarks by Senator Len B. Jordan, Idaho Reclamation Association Convention, Boise, Idaho, December 13, 1965

I am honored to be asked to keynote your annual convention. You, representatives of the Idaho Reclamation Association, are meeting at a time when the challenges of developing our State's land and water resources takes on added emphasis because of increased interest nationwide in the value of our water resources.

Your fine organization, with which it has been my pleasure to work for many years, has had a leading role in the development of Idaho. I am confident that you will not shirk this role at a time when our State's water resources are being coveted by people across the Nation for a variety of purposes other than making our desert bloom and produce for Idaho.

Water is more than a natural resource—it is a necessity of life. Here in the United States we have lived more than 200 years before the water problem became generally acute. But the uses we make of water in modern society are so tremendous that they stagger the imagination.

The coming of our industrial era, the raising of our living standards, and the increased application of water to land have now highlighted the problems until in much of the Nation there is grave and increasing concern over water resources.

Planning for the development of water resources has undergone a marked evolution during the past 50 years. At the turn of the century the use of water resources was planned largely on a single-purpose, single-project, single-agency basis. Too frequently other equally important uses of water were overlooked. This was because no agency was authorized to plan for comprehensive development. Each carried out its specific function as prescribed by law.

The local people, through established agencies, such as State water resource boards and/or interstate compact commissions should have an effective voice, along with the Federal agencies in this planning which would recognize and properly weigh all the varied and sometimes contrary programs affected by the proposed development of water resources.

In the Northwest we are especially favored with an abundance—sometimes a superabundance—of potable water. This is not to say that our water is always available in the right place at the right time. The problems of distribution are always with us. How to capture nature's rainfall on our watersheds and then by proper storage and supply management mold this water resource to best achieve its multipurpose benefits is a real challenge, but one that is richly rewarding. These multipurpose benefits must include domestic, industrial, reclamation, power navigation, recreation and fish and wildlife. No longer can we tolerate single-purpose planning.

Here in Idaho finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's desire to put its water resources to beneficial use. We must look to new financial sources as our traditional ones are growing short. Water user payments, power generation revenues and flood control benefits from our projects now being studied will not in most cases provide needed finances for the project.

Idahoans are almost unanimous in their belief that to assure that we do not lose our water, we must put it to use on the land. We have a similar unanimity for such projects as the Lower Teton Dam, Lynn Crandall Dam, supplemental water for areas south of the Snake River in Cassia, Twin Falls and Owyhee Counties, the southwest Idaho development project and other projects as yet unannounced. However, it is when the subject of getting these projects financed that we see our water resource development hopes stalemated.

Projects with a high benefit-to-cost ratio that could be paid out largely by water users have long since been constructed. After these were built we used power revenues to supplement water user fees to insure project feasibility. But the remaining water development projects in southern Idaho are far beyond the ability of water users to pay out in a reasonable length of time even with added power revenue benefits from the project.

With the reduction of rates for Federal power generation now under the Bonneville Power Administration, power revenues which might have been available to future Idaho projects have been reduced. And to date we haven't been able to get funds for Idaho projects from Federal projects downstream in the BPA system even though Idaho watersheds provide a substantial portion of the water which turns the turbines at these downstream sites. Thus, the financial straitjacket on Idaho water resource development becomes tighter.

Flood control benefits of Idaho projects are another help in financing. However, the recent signing of the Columbia River Treaty with Canada has preempted much of the flood control values that could have come from Idaho storage, because of the huge amount of Canadian storage, we have already purchased for this purpose. Here we see another financial source being materially reduced.

One basic point I wish to emphasize early in this statement is the interdependence of land and water. Any serious study or planning for one must necessarily and inevitably involve the other. Sound water resource development depends first of all on a healthy, well-maintained watershed. This is of primary importance.

Several years ago I spent a summer in Afghanistan investigating the economic feasibility of a large reclamation development. There I found that centuries of watershed abuse had first removed all of the timber from the slopes and the higher elevations. Overgrazing land had contributed to the destruction of the brush and grass cover, leaving insufficient vegetation to retard the runoff. Erosion was inevitable and devastating almost beyond belief. Soil movement had bared the hillsides to bedrock so that there was little more runoff retardation than from the roof of a building.

Masonry arched bridges perhaps a quarter of a mile long stood stark and desolate in the desert, mute evidence to the fact that a rampaging river had dammed its own channel by lodging debris against the bridge piers and then cutting a new channel as if in defiance of man's effort to contain it. At flood stage the river was a monster out of control. In the heat of summer when water was most needed the river would shrink to a docile, sluggish stream, an altogether inadequate fraction of its flood stage.

In Afghanistan I have seen drifting sand dunes uncover the houses of a village that was once the center of an irrigated agricultural community. Here are the ghosts of a civilization that perished for lack of water—a silent indictment of man's refusal to observe sound conservation practice.

This is where I learned more of the importance of watershed protection against complete ruination. Here is was indelibly printed in my mind that we cannot take for granted that water will always be available downstream, no matter how we abuse the watershed upstream.

In the Columbia Basin most of the watershed is federally owned. This poses a real problem because the funds available for watershed protection on public lands are not adequate. Moreover, funds which provide technical assistance to private landowners for soil conservation have been substantially reduced in the administration's budget.

In order to protect our watersheds, sometime in the not too distant future, it may be necessary to levy against power sales for headwater conservation purposes, including additional headwater storage. A very small assessment per kilowatt hour on all power sold, public, private, Federal, and non-Federal alike could provide a fund to keep the watersheds healthy. A prudent businessman employs similar methods to protect his long-range interest. No less prudent should be our approach to sound conservation and watershed protection.

A second point I wish to make is that there is no single uniform policy, no magic formula relating to water resources which can be applied to all parts of the country at all times and in all places. The problems involve particular needs and uses of water from State to State, from basin to basin and from region to region.

While it is generally sound to plan coordinated development of water resources by large river basin areas, it is possible to place too much importance on this concept without giving full consideration to the states as sovereign units in basin complexes because the large river systems have no respect for State lines. For example, basin planners must concede the validity of water rights that are perfected under State law.

Too often the upstream states of a river basin are short changed in the allocation of benefits derived from main stem plants downstream. A case in point is the Columbia Basin. Testimony before congressional committees indicates that some 13 million average kilowatts of hydroelectric power can be developed in the U.S. portion of the Columbia River Basin that will be cheaper than an alternate source. Most of this power development will be in the State of Washington or on its boundary. Yet the watersheds of the State of Washington will supply but a small part of the water that passes through these mainstem turbines.

Washington watersheds contribute less than 3 percent of the water at Grand Coulee, 8 percent of the water at Chief Joseph, and 13 percent of the water at McNary. Thus most of the water originates on upstream watersheds, but the downstream reclamation projects receive a lion's share of the benefits. Simple equity would call for a sharing of downstream benefits with upstream States which supply the water.

Insofar as upstream Canada is concerned the United States-Canada Treaty gives recognition to the contribution that will be made by yet-to-be-built Canadian storage. A cash payment of more than one-quarter of a billion dollars has been made by the United States to Canada. This will pay for Canada's entitlement to a share of increased production at U.S. plants downstream made possible by Canadian storage for a 30-year period. Bear in mind that not 1 gallon of new water will be added to the Columbia. What will be accomplished is a partial regulation of the steamflow, storing the flood peaks and releasing the water when normal streamflows are lowest. In addition Canada will receive $64 million for flood control benefits to the United States.

This treaty is a great step forward in river basin planning. As a former chairman of the U.S. section of the International Joint Commission, I was privileged to work on the early stages of the Columbia Treaty and I know firsthand the months and years of assembling the basic data which preceded the additional months and years of hard bargaining. The significant fact is that an accord was reached and consummated in a treaty thus indicating, at the international level, a meeting of trained minds as to the value of upstream watershed and storage resources.

Likewise the upstream watershed and storage resource of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, and Oregon make a contribution similar to, and perhaps even greater than, that to be made by Canada.

Now someone will probably challenge this comparison on the basis that much of the U.S. headwater storage is for reclamation and that part of this water is consumptively used. The answer is that the purpose of upstream storage is to capture the floods at or near the source and to release the stored waters as needed.

Irrigation accomplishes this purpose admirably. Even the water that is lost by transpiration or evaporation is returned in the form of added precipitation. Only that small part which becomes a part of the plant is truly lost.

In Idaho, on the Snake River alone, we have between 8 and 9 million acre-feet of storage now through reclamation projects. Two-thirds of this water returns to the Snake River during its low flows. Thus, by shaping and improving the runoff pattern, reclamation contributes substantial flood control benefits and hydropower benefits as well.

At present time no provision is made for upstream States to share in downstream benefits and there is no provision in the law for such a sharing. Nor is there any provision in the law that would prohibit some such arrangement as a Columbia Basin project account through which upstream reclamation projects might share in the downstream power revenues as an aid to reclamation beyond the ability of the water users to pay. This is not an unreasonable arrangement.

Let us review briefly, the evolution of reclamation law. The basic reclamation law, beginning in 1902, required that the cost of irrigation facilities be repaid, but without interest. Even though such projects benefited directly many other people in the community, the water users were responsible for the repayment of the total cost. Under this general requirement the projects which were relatively simple and easy to build were constructed, leaving the more complicated and expensive ones undeveloped. Although many of these more complicated and expensive irrigation projects are desirable and worthwhile, the water users are unable to return the irrigation costs in full and it is thus impossible to establish their feasibility under reclamation law without repayment assistance from sources other than the project lands.

In recognition of this situation the Congress has from time to time, enacted legislation providing for the use of power revenues to assist in the return of costs of a reclamation project.

Up until now only an individual project-by-project approach has been legislated in the Pacific Northwest. To illustrate: the Columbia Basin Reclamation project in the State of Washington of 1 million acres will require financial assistance in the amount of $474 million from power revenues from Grand Coulee Dam. By 1975 the power costs of Grand Coulee with interest will have been paid back to the Federal Government. The net power revenues from 1975 to 2022 are pledged to pay that part of the Columbia Basin reclamation project beyond the ability of the water users to pay. The water users on this project will pay $125 million.

This project is an outstanding example of a thoroughly sound reclamation project integrated physically and financially with a specific power project and using a substantial block of assistance from project power revenues.

However, under this piecemeal approach, the development of a reclamation project depended entirely upon the accident of location and the physical possibility of developing power in connection with irrigation on each side specific project. Other reclamation projects of equal merit but having no direct tie-in with a hydropower installation could not be developed unless power assistance was made available from another source not directly a part of the reclamation project.

Congress has met this problem in three major river basins of the West by providing for the use of power revenues to aid irrigation on a basinwide basis. The effect of this action has made possible the development of desirable but isolated irrigation projects by providing financial assistance from the pooled net power revenues of all Federal power projects in the basin after power costs and interest have been repaid to the Federal Government. The basins where this basin account principle applies include the Missouri, the Upper Colorado, and the central valley of California.

To date all efforts to implement a basin account for the Columbia have been unsuccessful. In lieu of a basin account a few isolated irrigation projects in the lower basin have been tied to a specific Federal power project not physically a part of or in any way connected with the irrigation project for which financial assistance is sought.

In my opinion this practice discriminates unfairly against an upstream State which supplies much more water for main stream powerplants than the downstream State which is the sole beneficiary of all funds that might be available for irrigation assistance from these downstream plants. Moreover, it could lead to the rejection of a sound reclamation project in an upstream State in favor of a downstream project of less merit.

The use of political muscle to reserve all power benefits downstream exclusively for downstream reclamation assistance does violence to the concept of the interdependence of land and water resources. It works a gross injustice on upstream States simply because the accident of a State boundary may separate the upstream watershed from the downstream hydroplants.

For many years the National Reclamation Association has been on record to the effect that reclamation development on a basin wide multipurpose basis is the only manner in which full utilization of river basin water resources can be realized.

A basinwide Columbia project account should be properly funded. I do not contend that the Federal power projects alone shall carry the whole burden of assistance to future reclamation. Every hydro powerplant in the Columbia Basin should contribute to the project account whether it be Federal, private, or non-Federal public.

Federal power projects do not require licenses from the Federal Power Commission. All other hydroplants do require 50-year licenses. As in other river basin accounts no funds would be available from Federal hydro projects until the power costs plus interest are repaid to the Federal Government and then only such unassigned revenue that has not been already pledged as authorized financial assistance to reclamation.

In the case of licensed projects no financial assistance should be required under existing licenses but should be a part of rate base for a license renewal.

The amount of assistance required and what legislation is necessary to implement a Columbia Basin project account are matters that should be discussed in a proper forum between the States involved and I believe the proper forum is a Columbia Basin compact meeting.

Back in 1951 when I was Governor of Idaho, at my instigation, a Columbia Basin compact proposal was made by Idaho to the other basin States. Over the years numerous meetings were held and more than once an acceptable compact seemed near accomplishment. Having worked on the Columbia Treaty, I know how worthwhile and productive such discussions can be. It is my hope that agreement among the State will soon be reached, for I earnestly believe the compact concept has a very real and mutually valuable place in interstate negotiations.

At present, the compact seems to be stalled. I regret that this is so. But a new approach to cooperative planning may be provided by the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 which I was pleased to cosponsor. The need is great for serious conferences between authorized representatives of the several States in the Columbia Basin. All of the States now have proper agencies to engage in open discussions of our many common problems. Idaho's new water resources board is off to a good start. I applaud its effort and its willingness to tackle the problems without fanfare or delay.

I turn now to another matter which should be of grave concern to Idaho reclamationists and conservationists. Recently there was introduced in the Congress the administration's wild rivers bill which would designate five rivers in the United States to be preserved in their wild state. Included in the five are Idaho's Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

Both of these rivers are part of a comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development as detailed in House Document 531 adopted by the 81st Congress, 2d session. This document indicates that the combined runoff of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers is greater than the total runoff of the Coloradio River Basin and that the combined hydroelectric potential of these two rivers is greater than the hydroelectric production of Grand Coulee Dam.

Do not forget that the Grand Coulee Dam is the paying partner for the "cash register" which supports the 1-million-acre project in the State of Washington. This will point up the magnitude of the economic values which will be lost to Idaho if the wild rivers bill passes in its present form.

Now we in Idaho agree that our two rivers have wild characteristics in abundance. We are not unmindful of the need to preserve for posterity something of this irreplaceable resource. We know, too, that two-thirds of the area of Idaho is federally owned, and that, of all the States in the Union, Idaho has the largest area set aside for a single purpose wilderness use—a wilderness that is traversed by many miles of streams of unsurpassed wild beauty.

So in Idaho we have a double loyalty in our great love for the wild, in our determination to protect our great wildlife and recreation resources and in our desire to grow and develop agriculturally and industrially. We believe that these objectives are not incompatible.

We are pleased that Idaho can contribute so much in wild beauty, spawning grounds, wildlife and recreation resources, and water in great abundance to the community of Northwest States, but frankly we believe that some place in this whole picture there should be a measure of reciprocity.

Because they are important to Idaho reclamationists, I quote the minority view of Senators Thomas H. Kuchel, Gordon Allott, Len Jordan, Milward Simpson, and Paul Fannin, on S. 1446, the wild rivers bill:

"We agree with the concept that certain of our Nation's great scenic rivers should be preserved in their free-flowing condition. We agree that such rivers should be set aside to promote sound water conservation and the public use and enjoyment of the scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. We agree that the policy of the Congress to preserve, develop, reclaim, and make accessible for the benefit of all the people selected parts of the Nation's free-flowing rivers is a commendable objective. This is a highly praiseworthy use of America's dwindling resources to meet the ever-increasing demand of our pleasure-seeking population and has its rightful place in the overall plan of national outdoor recreation.

"We agree in the proper use of river basin planning for additions to the system as outlined in section 3(c) of the proposed legislation, as well as the general procedures set forth in sections 3(d) and 3(e).

"A river or rivers should not be included in the wild river system if such inclusion would seriously disrupt the present or potential higher beneficial use of the river or the economy of the area through which the river flows or which it serves. No river should be set aside in perpetuity from future harnessing to supply water for our cities, for agriculture, for flood control, to generate hydroelectric power, or to aid navigation without careful and thorough study to determine whether it is feasible and desirable in the public interest. Review should be made of all comprehensive river basin plans, and potential alternative uses of the water and related land resources involved must be evaluated.

"Section 3(b) and following, of S. 1446, provide the procedure whereby certain designated and new rivers may be added to the wild river system. Such additions are subjected to a most thorough study and evaluation at all levels of government and by any and all agencies which may profess an interest. This is not so with respect to those rivers designated in section 3(a). The rivers listed in section 3(a) become 'instant' wild rivers upon the signing of the legislation, notwithstanding the fact that such rivers may be a part of a comprehensive river basin plan or subject to future study under State or Federal laws.

"Congress, at this session, enacted into law the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-80). Its specific purpose is to inventory and evaluate the water resources of the Nation, river by river, State by State, basin by basin, with Federal, State, and local participation. Congress also enacted into law the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (Public Law 89–72), whereby it expressed its intent to encourage non-Federal development and operation of recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement features of Federal water resources projects. The act recognizes that there are non-Federal as well as Federal responsibilities with respect to the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities and fish and wildlife enhancement and it is anticipated that the Federal water agencies will work with the States and local governments in the determination of the scale and development of these aspects of recreation.

"Both of the above acts contemplate comprehensive study before further action. We do not feel that such study has been given, or a complete investigation into the feasibility of including in the wild river system the two wholly Idaho rivers, the Salmon and the Clearwater, has been made.

"The committee considered and rejected amendments submitted by Senator Jordan which would have removed the two Idaho rivers from the 'instant' section, section 3(a), and placed them in the study section, section 3(b), while at the same time placing a moratorium on any further development of the rivers pending a full and comprehensive study of the potential economic need for future development of the rivers. It is our belief that further study would not defeat the purpose of this legislation and that the public has the right to know.

"Both of these rivers are a part of a comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development, incorporated in House Document 531 adopted by the 81st Congress, 2d session.

"The combined runoff of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers is greater than the total runoff of the Colorado River and the combined hydroelectric potential is greater than Grand Coulee or greater than all hydroelectric potential on the entire Colorado River.

"Back through the years these rivers (especially the Salmon) have been protected as sanctuaries for anadromous fish spawning. Until the dams versus fish controversy is settled no development plans are being pressed. Ever since the building of Grand Coulee Dam, which destroyed all upstream anadromous fish runs above that point, the few remaining spawning beds have increased in value and importance.

"The salmon problem will be solved in one of two ways: no salmon at all in the upper reaches (as appears possible now) or a means will be found to pass salmon over dams. (The new 750-foot Dworshak Dam will have facilities for migrating salmon.) In either case, it may be possible to have both fish and dams in the not too distant future. Until this is solved no one proposes dams and we do not.

"The importance of the decision to be made here must not be taken lightly. We are not arguing for dams in wild rivers. We do argue for the right to evaluate the effect of plan changes.

"The economic effect of an abrupt change for the Salmon and Clearwater from the plan adopted in House Document 531 is a subject of great concern. A Columbia Basin account does not exist. Thus the full economic shock of this change from full development to freeflowing status will be borne by Idaho alone. This is unwarranted, unnecessary, and inequitable. Idaho's greatest resource is water—it has no fossil fuels. To deprive one State of the right to evaluate the economic potential of two great rivers with a combined value equal to that of a fully developed Grand Coulee with its million-acre reclamation project or the equivalent of a fully developed Colorado River is the greatest inequity in this bill.

"The defeated Jordan amendment would have placed these two Idaho rivers in the study section with full guarantee to protect their free-flowing status until the economic dislocations are studied and worked out. The Green River in Wyoming, which faced similar controversy, was moved from the 'instant' section to the study section of the bill for further study.

"This present bill creates a National Wild Rivers System. But there is no language in the bill that would provide even partial compensation to a State for economic losses resulting from a change of plans from full development to freeflowing status of its rivers. Surely it is not intended to penalize one State excessively. Under the circumstances, the least that should be done is to regard the inclusion of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers in the 'instant' section of the bill as a Columbia Basin contribution. This would involve full basin account status for Idaho in the community of Columbia Basin States. For this there is ample precedent. Even in this bill the segment of the Missouri River, now in the study section, if placed in the wild river system would be a Missouri Basin contribution to the system rather than a contribution wholly and solely by Montana.

"We think it is important that wild rivers be designated where the people are so that many more can enjoy this resource. The bounties attaching to wild river designation should not be confined to areas already served by abundant resources for outdoor recreation. This is so important that perhaps no State should have two rivers until all States have one river so designated. The stated purpose to reclaim and restore could very well apply to such rivers as the polluted Potomac which is a national disgrace.

"As has been mentioned before, the primary purpose of the bill is to keep the wild rivers in a freeflowing condition. A report from the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, indicates that the Salmon River and the Clearwater River may be too wild. These rivers are the worst flooders on the Columbia River system.

"While these two rivers in an average year contribute only 14 percent of the normal flow of the Columbia River at the Dalles, in 1948, when millions of dollars of damage was done by the flood waters of the Columbia, the Salmon and the Clearwater contributed 27 percent to the floodflow. In the disastrous flood of 1964, the two rivers contributed 30 percent. Dworshak Dam, now under construction on the north fork of the Clearwater, would only reduce these percentages to 23 and 25½ percent, respectively.

"The bill prohibits the Federal Power Commission from authorizing a dam or other project work under the Federal Power Act in any wild river area except as specifically authorized by Congress. It should clearly be understood that no legislation could prevent Congress from authorizing necessary and desirable flood control projects or other public works of any kind if any subsequent Congress made such a decision.

WATER RIGHTS

"During the consideration of this bill by the Interior Committee, certain amendments submitted by us were adopted by the committee and are a part of the bill as sections 5(d) and 5(h). These amendments clearly express the intent of the committee that, by the passage of this legislation there will be no change in the established principles of Federal-State water law.

"There will not be a reservation or appropriation of all unappropriated water of the rivers and streams included in the wild river system areas. There will be a reservation of waters only for the purposes outlined in the bill and only in quantities necessary to accomplish these purposes.

"When acquiring water rights for wild river purposes, rights which are vested under established principles of State or Federal law, just compensation shall be paid.

"The jurisdiction of the States over waters of any stream included in a wild river area should not be affected by the passage of this bill. The Federal Government should be required to comply with State laws when acquiring water rights or vested interests therein.

"We shall reoffer amendments for consideration by the Senate which will expressly confirm these principles. Subsequent to committee action, the Department of the Interior has advised that it does not object to the adoption of these amendments."

In his letter to the President of the Senate endorsing the national wild rivers system, Secretary of Interior Stewart L. Udall had this to say:

"The President, in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, called attention to the need to protect the beauty of America, which he noted has sustained our spirit and enlarged our vision for more than three centuries. He expressed the hope that some of the unspoiled stretches of our waterways will be preserved under a wild rivers bill. There is a need to act now to protect this part of our heritage.

"In his February 8 message on natural beauty the President recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. The enactment of the draft bill enclosed with this letter will carry out that recommendation. The bill is designed to preserve, reclaim, and make available for the benefit of all the American people specifically chosen segments of the Nation's diminishing resources of free-flowing rivers.

"While river flows have been harnessed to aid navigation, control floods, increase farm productivity, and hydroelectric power, too little attention has been given to the importance of protecting the very water we drink and the values of fish and wildlife, scenic, and outdoor recreation resources. These values, although often measureless in commercial terms, should be preserved by a program that will guarantee America her heritage of unspoiled, unpolluted, free-flowing rivers. Our belief is shared by a wide range of public and private authorities, and the time to act is now, before it is too late."

So I repeat that I do not disagree in principle with the purpose and objectives of a National Wild Rivers System. I repeat also from the language of the minority views that no provision is made to compensate a State for economic losses resulting in a change of plans from full development of its rivers to less than full development in order to provide free-flowing wild rivers "for the benefit of all the American people."

I believe the wild rivers bill, S. 1446, should be amended to correct what obviously might be an unreasonable diminution of a State's natural resource potential for a national purpose.

Without attempting to suggest the wording of such an amendment, certain basic equities should be maintained. For example: If the dedication of the output of the watersheds of a State is made "for all of the people" then all of the people should make fair restitution to the State for the loss of potential economic alternate development. The language of the amendment should be broad enough to cover any wild river in any State.

It just happens that Idaho is asked to contribute two of the five rivers of the initial Wild Rivers System. It just happens that Idaho's two rivers have greater economic value under alternate development than all the other rivers mentioned in the bill.

The amendment should provide, therefore, that whatever net economic losses are sustained, that State should receive from the Federal Government a nonreimbursable credit for application to water resource development as determined by that State, approximately equal to the loss sustained.

There is a wealth of precedence for the use of nonreimbursable costs in resource development. Let me cite a few:

The rivers, canals, and harbors of the Nation have been improved and maintained from the Federal Treasury. There is no reimbursement. The users of the waterways pay nothing for the transportation arteries into which hundreds of millions of dollars have been poured. It is justified on grounds that cheaper transportation by water is a national asset.

A second precedent is found in the Flood Control Act. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the Federal Government to protect people, farmlands, home, and industries from the ravages of floodwaters. No portion of the funds so paid is reimbursable, or ever has been. This is based on the proposition that safety from flood damage makes for a greater national prosperity.

A third and even more illuminating precedent is found in the authorization of several recent projects wherein the benefits calculated for recreation and for fish and wildlife are capitalized and treated as nonreimbursable items. To illustrate, the Touchet division of the Walla Walla projects will cost $15,709,000, of which nearly $8 million, or more than 50 percent, is allocated to fish and wildlife enhancement, a nonreimbursable item. Again, under the justification that such development is a national asset.

What, then, could be so unfair in recognizing the need to make a State whole if certain of its resources are taken for all the people of the Nation—resources which, under alternate development, would enrich the economy of the State concerned.

Senate bill 1446 provides for a review board consisting of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. and the Governors of the several States.

The purpose of this board is to consider the change of circumstances of the status of any river included within the National Wild Rivers System and to report to each Congress any significant changes that might call for legislative action.

The duties of this review board could be expanded to include making a determination of economic losses to a State arising from inclusion of a river or rivers in the National Wild Rivers System for the benefit of all the people. Restitution could be provided in the form on nonreimbursable credit for such water development assistance as the preempted resources might have made to a State's economy under full or at least an alternate plan of development. Such nonreimbursable credit should be utilized entirely at the discretion of the affected State.

I ask you as reclamationists to weigh carefully the merit of the plan I suggest here. This plan is definitely in the interest of wise use and proper conservation of our land and water resources without imposing undue burden on any area. I urge the proponents and the sponsors of S. 1446 to join me in my effort to make a wild river bill workable and equitable.

The amendment should be written in general language to cover all dislocations in all other States where wild rivers are involved. This is simply the application of the accepted rule in water resource development that recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement are nonreimbursable items.

What is Idaho's stake in such an amendment? Let us look at some figures on S. 1446 which are used here for illustrative purposes only, subject to the refinement that proper research will provide. On the credit side of the account the Northwest will gain the preservation of a fish resource calculated by the Fish and Wildlife Service to be worth $11,062,000 per year.

On the debit side Idaho will lose potential hydroelectric production estimated in House Document No. 531 as being in excess of 2 million kilowatts valued conservatively at $40 million per year. Idaho will also lose the flood protection that proper stream regulation would provide. But, from a reclamation standpoint by far the most important point, is that Idaho will also lose the reclamation assistance that this hydroelectric production would provide in a total amount not less than $400 million based on the fact that a comparable hydroelectric output at Grand Coulee Dam provides that amount of assistance to about 1 million acres of new land.

I have spent enough time at the bargaining table with our Canadian neighbors on similar water resource problems to know that Idaho has an interest in wild rivers legislation that must be protected and defended by proper amendment before the bill is passed.

To sum up: I repeat what I said at the beginning: Finances are the greatest stumbling block to Idaho's future reclamation development. There is general unanimity for such projects as Lower Teton, Lynn Crandall, for supplemental water for Salmon Falls, new water and supplemental for other vast areas on both sides of the Snake River in eastern and southern Idaho, the southwestern Idaho development project which must include also the Weiser, Payette, and pumping projects in the Bruneau and Wickahoney areas.

Idaho's reclamation future depends on developing a reliable paying partner to supplement what the water users can pay.

Idaho must look to the output of its own watersheds for this source. This is Idaho's entitlement—our resource heritage.

Before we surrender—without compensation—Idaho reclamation's potential cashbox to a National Wild Rivers System, let us be sure we know what we are doing.

Like Father, Like Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest handicaps any young man may experience in growing into manhood is following in the footsteps of an illustrious father. Not that dad deliberately does anything to overshadow his son; but the fame of the father just rubs off on his son's shoulders.

One of my dear friends, and a constituent, has a son who already has made a name for himself. His father, Dr. V. D. Mattia, 340 Kingsland Road, Nutley, has capped a brilliant career recently when he was chosen to be the president of Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., one of the world's major pharmaceutical companies. Dr. Mattia served with distinction at sea in the Naval Medical Corps during World War II and Korea, and combining a brilliant business sense with his equally brilliant medical aptitude, has risen rapidly through the ranks to the very top of his company, and his profession.

His son, Peter, is a fine student and athlete who a few days ago was honored in his hometown as the Athlete-Student of the Year. Such an award is always worthy of praise, but this year especially so, for Peter does not attend the local high school in Nutley. And this year marked the first time in the long history of the award that the selection committee chose a young man who did not attend the local school system. This will help give an idea what a superlative lad Peter must be. But the story is better told in an editorial by the publisher of the Nutley Sun, Frank A. Orechio, in the current edition of his paper.

As you will see, in Nutley they will be referring not to "the doctor's son," but to "Peter's father" when they talk about a Mattia these days:

[From the Nutley (N.J.) Sun]

LIKE FATHER, LIKE SON

Three weeks ago a proud son with beaming eyes observed the Nation applaud the spectacular achievement of a famous father.

On Saturday night the roles were reversed. A proud father, in the company of an equally proud mother, sat silently in the audience listening to speakers extol the virtues of their honored son.

The proud father was Dr. Virginius (Barney) Mattia, who, at the age of 42, on January 1, became president of Hoffmann-LaRoche, Inc., one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies.

The honored son is Peter Mattia, a champion wrestler and recipient of all-State honors as a lineman at St. Benedict's football team. On Saturday evening Peter was awarded the American Legion's Annual Scholastic Sports Award. Young Mattia's achievements at St. Benedict's were of such magnitude that local American Legion officials responsible for the selection broke precedence this year to name a non-Nutley High School athlete as the award winner.

It is not easy for a son to establish his own identity while living in the shadows of a famous father. His father's attainments have proven to be a stimulating inspiration for Peter. Peter has been offered 30 full 4-year scholarships to the Nation's leading colleges—overwhelming proof that his outstanding accomplishments serve to carry out his own unmistakable image.

The American Legion officials who headed up the selection committee were Vincent Donohue and William Pratt. They and their committee members are to be congratulated for developing nomination procedures which permit our community to honor our most outstanding athletes by throwing the contest open to all local students regardless of the school attended.

The Donohue-Pratt committee is also entitled to congratulations for awarding the Legion's Amateur Award to a former Nutley High School star.

Policy Statement on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Synagogue Council of America, in a statement approved on January 14, 1966, has added its voice to the chorus of thoughtful Americans who are asking for a peaceful solution to the war in Vietnam.

The Synagogue Council of America, which represents the united voice of Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform Judaism, is an organization of the following six national Jewish religious bodies: Central Conference of American Rabbis, Rabbinical Assembly, Rabbinical Council of America, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, United Synagogue of America.

The council's policy statement explains:

> Having searched our conscience, we have come to the conclusion that peace and the cessation of hostilities must remain our major objective.

The statement goes on to commend the President's current peace offensive and to urge the administration not to be swayed from this course by those who would escalate and expand the war.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the thoughtful statement of the Synagogue Council of America, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT ON VIETNAM ISSUED BY THE SYNAGOGUE COUNCIL OF AMERICA

A decisive contribution of Judaism to the morality of international affairs is the affirmation that nations, like individuals, must be guided in their actions by justice and morality.

Nations, like individuals, cannot escape God's judgment, for "He will judge the universe with justice, and nations with righteousness" ("vehu yishpot tevel betzedek, yadin le'umin bemesharim"). Because nations are comprised of individuals, it is ultimately the individual who must assume moral responsibility and moral judgment in the affairs of his country. This we must do not only because of the imperatives of our religious commitments but also because we cherish the prerogative of citizens in a democratic society to express their views.

No one course of action in this complicated situation can clearly solve the moral dilemma in which we find ourselves. The U.S. commitment to the Government of South Vietnam has created a moral responsibility which we cannot ignore in our quest for peace. Yet, having searched our conscience, we have come to the conclusion that peace and the cessation of hostilities must remain our major objective.

Along with Americans of all faiths, we confront with deep sorrow the loss of American and Vietnamese lives, both North and South, and the suffering of the civilian population in that agonized and war-torn country. Our religious conscience compels us to exert every influence so that the action in Vietnam can be moved from the battlefield to the negotiating table.

We therefore note with gratification that President Johnson has on numerous occasions committed the administration to the principle of unconditional discussions leading to the negotiation of the cessation of hostilities and a peace settlement.

We particularly wish to commend President Johnson and the administration for the recent halt in bombing of North Vietnam. It serves as a convincing demonstration that despite pressures from some quarters for a military solution to the problem, the purpose of our military effort in Vietnam remains one that is aimed at speeding an honorable settlement. It is also a convincing demonstration of the integrity of President Johnson's public expressions of our willingness to negotiate unconditionally.

We are deeply concerned that in the event the present halt in the bombing of North Vietnam fails to elicit the prayed-for response from Hanoi and the administration feels constrained to resume these bombings, discouragement and frustration may alter the present character of the conflict as a limited war for limited goals; i.e., the integrity of South Vietnam. The danger of new pressures for unlimited escalation of the war resulting from impatience and disappointment is grave indeed. Such an escalation would not only fail to achieve our goals, but would ultimately involve the world in a war of mutual destruction.

We therefore urge the administration—

To persist in its present efforts to pursue every possible avenue, including channels of the United Nations, that may create more favorable circumstances in which negotiations can begin; and

To steadfastly adhere to the principle that there cannot be a satisfactory military solution to this problem, and until a negotiated settlement is achieved, not to permit a change in the restrained character of this conflict through military escalation.

We further recommend that the United States should consider the following suggestions:

1. Request the United Nations to begin negotiations wherever and whenever possible for a cease-fire agreement (including cessation of terrorist activities) under United Nations supervision, among the governments of the United States, of North and South Vietnam, including representation for the National Liberation Front, and other interested parties, and to convene a peace conference to explore the basis of a settlement of the long-term issues and the means to give such a settlement effective international guarantees.

2. Make clear that a primary objective of a settlement of the Vietnam conflict is the independence of South Vietnam from outside interference, with complete liberty to determine the character of its future government by the result of a peaceful, free, and verified choice of its people.

3. Declare itself in favor of the phased withdrawal of all its troops and bases from the Vietnamese territory, if and when they can be replaced by adequate international peacekeeping forces, composed of military contingents capable of maintaining order while the peace settlement is being carried out.

4. Make available, through Congress, in fulfillment of the President's proposal, immediate reconstruction assistance and long-range economic development funds for southeast Asia, preferably through an effective international organization in which the beneficiary governments fully participate.

We do not lay claim to moral certitude and refrain from moral dogmatism in this complex and agonizing situation. Within the range of religious commitment and concern, differences as to specific policies can and do exist. We recognize that those who see the need for checking Communist subversion by military means are no less dedicated to the cause of a just world peace than those who believe the United States must cease hostilities in Vietnam. We do believe, however, that the imperatives of our religious commitments call for the recommendations we prayerfully put forward and commend to the attention of our synagogues throughout the land.

Rabbi Seymour J. Cohen,
President, Synagogue Council of America.
Rabbi Jacob J. Weinstein,
President, Central Conference of American Rabbis.
Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath,
President, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Rabbi Max Routtenberg,
President, Rabbinical Assembly.
Moses I. Feuerstein,
President, Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.
Rabbi Israel Miller,
President, Rabbinical Council of America.
Henry N. Rapaport,
President, United Synagogue of America.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 84th birthday anniversary of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of the greatest Presidents of all time. I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying special tribute to this truly outstanding humanitarian and distinguished world leader.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I call to your attention a portion of page 809 of the Congressional Record of January 30, 1948. The letter published therein and reproduced below was written by the late Fleetwood Richards, Sr., of Lockhart, Tex., whose son, Fleetwood Richards, Jr., now serves as my administrative assistant in Austin. Senator Richards was one of the greatest honest-to-goodness humanitarian leaders who ever lived. He knew human nature better than any man I have known.

Few men have been more loyal to the ideals of a President than Mr. Richards, Sr., was to President Roosevelt. His letter to his lovely wife is a warm and touching reflection of the love our country held for President Roosevelt. Similarly, the letter written to the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson was a tribute to the love and affection he held for Mr. Johnson whose cause he supported from the first day. He recognized then, as we all do now, that Mr. Johnson, a close friend and supporter of President Roosevelt, was an unusual leader—a warmhearted man whose star was ascending and who possessed qualities similar to those of President Roosevelt.

The letter was placed in the Record 18 years ago yesterday by the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, my predecessor, who now serves as our great President.

Both the letter and Mr. Johnson's remarks, then as now, are fitting memorials to the late F.D.R. They are as follows:

The Late Franklin Delano Roosevelt

Mr. Johnson of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1882 was born a man destined to guide his country through its greatest perils. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his countrymen, so they loved him. That affection of one man for the many—and of the many for one man—bound our Nation together in a unity we have missed since he left us.

The altogether personal affection so many millions of us felt for Mr. Roosevelt was brought into poignant focus when he died. In our teeming cities, in small towns, at crossroad stores, and along lonely country trails, almost unbearable grief came to the people of America.

To those shocking words, "Roosevelt is dead," men, women, and children reacted as though the news concerned one near and dear to them. Some wept. Some were swept by black despair. Some were appalled at the unfillable gap left in the world's leadership.

In the small town of Lockhart, Tex., in my congressional district, one who loved Roosevelt found some comfort in the way so many of us find it: He told his wife what was in his heart. She was away from home, and he wrote her. I lately obtained a copy of that letter, written by Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart.

Mr. Richards has a distinguished record of public service in our Texas Legislature. Because his letter so beautifully expressed the sorrow so many of us felt on that fateful day in 1945, and expressed it in language beyond our capacity, I have presumed upon my friendship with Mr. Richards to offer the letter today as a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

Lockhart, Tex.,
April 13, 1945.

My Dearest Gussie: Roosevelt is dead. Sorrow and gloom shrouds the town of Lockhart and its people. Business and people are almost at a standstill. Golf has not been mentioned in almost a full day. The report of his death reached me in the Domino Hall. That is where Americanism lingers in the rough. There is where it is most typical. There is where Roosevelt is most loved and appreciated. There is where labor relaxes and recreates. The news stopped every game. No sounds were audible, except sighs. The leader of their hopes, the prince of their cause, their refuge, had gone. Silently, they went away. They walked slower, they talked less, and they thought more. It was the saddest moment in all American life. Their ship was without a rudder.

In his going, anxiety reached its greatest peak. Determination did not seem to falter or hesitate. It seemed to absorb vengeance. Hope was uncertain. It must wait. The future must build and sustain it. World peace took a body blow. It did not fall. It did not take the count. It is disappointed, and that disappointment should be, and must be, its inspiration and determination to work, to sacrifice, and to succeed. It is humanity's only hope.

In a weak and humble way, on every occasion, and at every call, I have tried to shoulder my responsibility to him and the cause that he represents. Maybe I have been a small part of a great undertaking. I feel so. I served him and his cause, and the people's cause, as I see it, with an apostle's devotion, free of selfish motive.

I say, and maybe I never could have said it before, a man is dead that I never doubted or questioned. Somehow, I followed him and his leadership with a faith and confidence, free of every doubt. He gave a part of his life's span to the cause of humanity and liberty. In it all, I think that he was conscientious. To the downtrodden, he was as faithful as Paul was to Christ. He served and saved others. "Himself he could not save."

I never committed an act or spoke a word that made his road longer or his burden heavier. I never added weight to his weakened body or his troubled mind. I tried to give him strength. I might have been, and I think that I was, a little more diligent and devoted to him, and the purposes and ideals that he championed, than I have been to myself and my own soul. In it all, I am satisfied.

Love,

Fleetwood.

Appendix

Thanks for the Lift

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter entitled "Thanks for the Lift," from Mr. W. R. Luckfield, chairman of the Congressional Action Committee of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce. The suggested letter, hypothetical though it may be, will no doubt fit many situations, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

THANKS FOR THE LIFT

JANUARY 15, 1966.

With the passage of the Medicare bill now a certainty we hope that all senior citizens will write letters of gratitude to their children, grandchildren, neighbors and friends who are still of the burden bearing age.

Most of the elderly can honestly say that they seriously need the assistance in meeting hospital costs and that the increase in their monthly social security checks will just about cover the steady rise in the cost of living.

However, a hundred thousand or so of the social security and medicare recipients will have to go into a little more detail and their letters might run somewhat along these lines:

DEAR NEPHEW: I just had to write and express my gratitude for your generosity in shouldering a heavier tax to make things easier for me and your aunt in our retirement years.

I know that many of us elderly people have spouted off a lot about the shortcomings of the younger generation, but I must say that the cheerful manner in which you are accepting those increases in the social security rates is an indication of your generosity, unselfishness and devotion to us old folks.

You know of course how much it costs to live comfortably these days and your own experience when your kids had their tonsils removed last year shows how much a few days in the hospital can cost.

Your Aunt Mamie was in the hospital for a week last year after she fell and broke her arm while getting out of our new cabin cruiser. You should have seen the bill—and I had to cash in two shares of my Tidwiddy Consolidated stock to pay it.

As you know, your aunt and I must make do on the $12,000 a year pension the directors voted me when I retired as corporation president and the $8,000 or so that my investments bring each year plus our monthly social security checks.

That may sound like a pretty good income, but you have no idea how much it costs to maintain the winter place here in Florida and the summer home in Maine. And it's a scandal what wages you have to pay cooks, maids, gardeners, chauffeurs, and cruiser pilots these days.

I was going through my old check stubs just the other night and found that your Aunt Mamie spent almost a thousand dollars last year in beauty treatments alone. And, boy, I don't even dare tell you how much we spent on that Mediterranean cruise and the fishing trips in the new cabin cruiser. It's a 36-footer and sleeps five, but crew wages, fuel, and upkeep just about keep me strapped.

We ran into another big expense last year when we redid the five bedrooms and installed the swimming pool at our Florida place. These interior decorators and contractors sure know how to charge and their bills looked like the national debt. (I'm sorry we're passing that debt on to your generation but that's the way the old ball bounces sometimes, eh?)

Well Nephew, if you can get your nose away from the grindstone some of these times, drop in on your aunt and me in Florida or Maine after we get back from the world cruise we're planning for this spring.

I hope the few extra bucks they will soon be taking out of your paycheck won't inconvenience you and the family. You can always cut a little here and there when you know you're doing it for a good cause. Just keep your chin up and remember how grateful your aunt and I are for the extra help.

Well, keep the checks coming, work hard and get ahead, and I hope the social security system is still working when you reach retirement age in 1995.

YOUR UNCLE BEN.

Proposed Repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, the membership of local 481, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, Glasgow, Ky., has urged my support of efforts to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act in a telegram dated January 21. In accordance with the members' request, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GLASGOW, KY.,
January 21, 1966.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
437 Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Please vote for the repeal of 14(b) of Taft-Hartley Act. Here is your chance to prove, to us working people, you are our friend. We request that this telegram be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The 400 MEMBERS OF
LOCAL 481, ILGWU,
Glasgow, Ky.

Democratic Dismay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, in their column "Inside Report," published in the Washington Post of January 25, 1966, make a very interesting analysis of the problems confronting the Democratic Party today. Their column follows:

INSIDE REPORT: DEMOCRATIC DISMAY

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

"A national committee has no claim to existence if it abolishes voter registration. The very willingness to even suspend it for any period of time is appalling."

So reads a private memorandum from an eastern Democratic political pro now being privately circulated in Washington. The memorandum reflects a rising concern among Democratic professional policitians that the party faces deep trouble in the fall elections.

Considering Mr. Johnson's record plurality in 1964 and the topheavy Democratic majorities in Congress, this alarm may seem misplaced. But the confidential memorandum pinpoints a decline in vigor and inner strength of local Deomcratic organizations. This decline fully justifies the doleful forecast of possible heavy losses in congressional and State elections this fall.

A major reason for the decline is the revolutionary but almost unnoticed switch in Democratic fundraising techniques—from a large number of small contributions to a small number of large contributors.

Fundraising now is concentrated in the President's club, instituted by President Kennedy and expanded by President Johnson. Composed of well-heeled business and industrial leaders (most of them not having the remotest connection with local Democratic organizations), the President's club has minimized local fundraising.

Consequently, the special favors that used to go to the local politicians, such as well-publicized White House dinners with the President, now go to the business fatcats. This costs local leaders prestige at home and reduces their stake in the party's national fortunes.

But the fundraising change is only one of many factors contributing to erosion of the Democratic Party's historic and basic strength: its local organizations.

Almost as important is President Johnson's politics of consensus. The President's consensus knows no party lines.

In short, the President's strength depends today not on local Democratic Party organizations so much as it does on a wholly unique Johnson organization, cutting across party lines. A Republican banker such as New York's David Rockefeller can get inside the White House easier today than a Democratic leader such as Brooklyn's Stanley Steingut. Local party leaders don't like it.

The identity of the men who control national politics for President Johnson today illustrates how far he has moved party control from its traditional power centers.

Democratic National Chairman John W. Bailey, an experienced professional from Connecticut, is a figurehead. Texan Clifton Carter, national committee executive director, runs national headquarters on a day-to-day basis. But the controlling figure is White House Aid W. Marvin Watson, Jr., whose political experience was limited to the rightwing—the controlling faction, usually—of the highly factionalized Democratic Party in Texas.

Like Carter, Watson's knowledge of big-city industrial-State politics is scant. With Watson, non-Southern Democratic politicians have no sense of identification. Watson's world of politics has no relevance to the politics of Philadelphia, Chicago, or Detroit.

This was shown in Watson's decision to cut the heart out of the national committee's registration division last month (for economy reasons). The step infuriated not only local party leaders but also Democratic Congressmen.

Beyond this, moreover, is the lack of new attractive Democratic candidates for major offices this fall—a lack explained perhaps by the dominance of the Kennedys and Lyndon Johnson the past 5 years.

In New York, Ohio, California, and elsewhere the party is split by internal friction. Heap on top of this the decline of local organization and the urgency behind that confidential memo is apparent. It's no wonder worried Democrats hope the President himself will take notice of his party's disorder.

Taxation of Antitrust Treble Damage Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Internal Revenue Service rulings on private treble damage actions under the antitrust laws have given favored tax treatment to antitrust violators. These rulings have weakened the vigor of our antitrust policies, penalized the victims of unlawful predatory business practices, increased the tax burden on the general public, and benefited convicted antitrust criminals. I am introducing a bill that is designed to reaffirm Congress direction for an effective antitrust program and correct the mistakes that have been made by the Internal Revenue Service.

On July 24, 1964, the IRS promulgated Revenue Ruling 64–224 for the benefit of the electrical equipment manufacturers industry. This ruling permits amounts paid to persons for injuries resulting from antitrust violations to be deductible as "ordinary and necessary" business expense by the violator. When the IRS issued this regulation, Senator HART, as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, jointly denounced the ruling as a tax giveaway, at the expense of other taxpayers, to corporations which had been found guilty of criminal antitrust violations. We pointed out that the ruling rewarded lawlessness, and that the Government would lose millions in tax dollars.

As a result of these and other protests, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on November 18, 1964, under the leadership of Senator Harry F. Byrd and Representative WILBUR MILLS, decided to review the entire matter. The staff was requested to collect and summarize, for the use of the joint committee, relevant legislative materials and viewpoints of various groups of interested parties as to policies and probable consequences of the Revenue Ruling 64–224. I submitted an extensive analysis of the legislative history and relevant judicial decisions, which to my mind made it clear that the IRS ruling is erroneous and contrary to the policies established by Congress.

The Department of Justice submitted a weak and equivocal statement to the Joint Committee. In its statement, the Department of Justice pointed out that, although the IRS position was not one that the Department would have reached had it been charged with responsibility, and although the Department would have been prepared to defend in court a rule of complete nondeductibility, it nonetheless deferred to the position taken by the Treasury and relied upon Congress to be the final arbiter in balancing the competing antitrust and tax considerations. On November 1, 1965, the Joint Committee staff submitted its summary, without recommendation, to the Joint Committee for further consideration. The staff suggested, however, that legislation may be appropriate to correct errors made by the IRS.

We need legislation that clearly defines congressional intent as to the priority of the policy embodied in the antitrust laws over tax questions with respect to private antitrust treble damage actions. This will eliminate any possibility that the IRS in the future would again distort congressional policy through changes in its rulings.

The IRS ruling has its origin in one of the most callous antitrust cases to reach the courts: the price fixing and bid regulating cases in the early 1960's against General Electric Co., Westinghouse and other electrical equipment manufacturers. In these cases the Government indicted 20 companies for conspiring to fix prices in sales of electrical equipment to Government and to industry. The defendants admitted their responsibility and pleaded guilty to the charges. Substantial fines were imposed and several corporate officials were sent to jail. In the wake of these Government victories, more than 2,000 private cases were filed against General Electric Co., Westinghouse and other electrical equipment manufacturers. Conservative estimates placed the potential total liability of the defendants in these private cases at nearly $300 million.

Since it reduces treble damages to approximately double damages, the effect of the IRS ruling is to award a gift of nearly $150 million to these admittedly guilty electrical equipment manufacturers. Other American taxpayers, who already have been victimized by the conspirators and required to pay higher prices for electrical equipment and for electrical service, must make up the loss in revenue that the Government suffers through the ruling.

Private actions to collect damages from antitrust violators traditionally have been relied upon as an important adjunct to antitrust law enforcement. To stimulate private actions, Congress authorized treble damages, with the intent, always, to provide an additional method to punish antitrust violators. Until the IRS made its ruling, no one believed that defendants, who had caused damages through violations of the antitrust laws, would be allowed to deduct treble damage payments as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. There is a long history in our legislative and judicial precedents that establishes that a treble damage requirement is punitive in nature. To allow such damages in antitrust cases to be deducted under our tax laws frustrates the national policy that makes price fixing in interstate and foreign commerce a criminal offense.

Since its ruling became public, I consistently have protested the IRS gift to the electrical equipment manufacturers. During all of this time, I have hoped that the IRS would repudiate its ruling. I believe the IRS should, even at this late date, repudiate its ruling. Repudiation would correct their error, and at the same time would permit the companies to try the issue in court and in that forum establish, if they can, a right to a deduction. Unless the ruling is repudiated, however, no individual taxpayer can go to court to test its validity.

The IRS, however, seems to be more amenable to the argument of the antitrust conspirators. I have given up hope that the IRS will move to correct the situation. Legislation is required. The bill I introduce, of course, can only have prospective application. If the IRS would repudiate its ruling the effect would be retroactive and the electrical equipment companies would not enjoy this tax windfall. This cannot be accomplished by legislation.

In keeping with my conviction that legislation is needed to clarify and emphasize the overriding public policy involved in private treble damage antitrust actions, my bill also remedies IRS and judicial rulings as to the tax treatment of damages recovered by the plaintiff in a successful antitrust suit. At the present time, such recoveries are treated as income to the successful plaintiff. The effect of this ruling, which was affirmed by the Supreme Court in the Glenshaw case—*Commissioner of Internal Revenue* v. *Glenshaw Glass Co.*, 348 U.S. 426 (1954)—reduces the amount of damages the successful plaintiff is able to recover and retain. Reduction of this recovery lessens the incentive to bring private actions, and the Government loses the benefits of supplementary private antitrust enforcement. My bill makes it clear that recoveries in excess of damages sustained shall not be treated as income to the successful plaintiff.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 12319

A bill to amend section 4 of the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C., section 15), and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (15 U.S.C., sec. 15), is hereby amended by inserting "(a)" after Section 4, and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of this section on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, the amount recovered in excess of the damages sustained shall not be treated as income for purposes of any law of the United States imposing a tax on income. In any action pending or instituted under subsection (a) of tihs section or under section 4A of this Act on or after the date of enactment of this subsection, no payment made by any defendant pursuant to any judgment or settlement of such action shall be deductible as ordinary and necessary expense under any law of the United States imposing a tax on income."

Representatives Cautioned To Watch Excesses of Commission on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record, I would like to include a statement made before a meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama on Monday during the annual Washington conference.

The following statement was made by Mr. James B. Brand, director of industrial relations, of James B. Clow & Sons, of Birmingham, Ala. Mr. Brand's statement deals fairly and honestly with the enforcement of the civil rights law of 1964 and the investigations conducted in Alabama by the Civil Rights Commission.

Statement in the Industrial Relations Field, Presented Before the Alabama Congressional Delegation, January 24, 1966, by James B. Brand

Subject: Equal employment opportunity, H.R. 10065.

In November and December 1965, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights held committee hearings in Birmingham, Mobile, and Huntsville on title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Jacques E. Wilmore, director of the mid-South region, stated the findings of the committee indicated that major Alabama employers have taken title VII seriously and were complying within their capabilities. In fact, Alabama has done more than most States in this area.

Our association has distributed numerous bulletins explaining the responsibilities of employers and how they should go about complying with title VII. In addition, AIA has sponsored workshops on this subject throughout Alabama. We feel our efforts contributed to the favorable findings of the Civil Rights Commission.

Although the Civil Rights law of 1964 has been effective for 7 months, a new law—H.R. 10065 (equal employment opportunity) has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

Without going into minute details, I will point out some of the bill's salient features:

1. Upon enactment, any business which employs 100 or more would be covered; 50 or more on June 2, 1966, and 8 or more on June 2, 1967. A radical change from title VII.

2. This bill would allow the filing of a complaint based on an unlawful practice which occurred up to a period of 1 year prior to the filing of the charge—a substantial extension of the present legal 90-day statute of limitations. Facts surrounding an alleged discriminatory act could very easily be illusionary after a 1-year period.

3. The Commission would have the authority to issue cease-and-desist orders and require action including reinstatement or hiring, with or without pay. Such orders could require the respondent to make reports periodically showing the extent to which he has complied.

4. The Commission could petition a circuit court of appeals or any appropriate district court for enforcement on its orders. Any findings of fact by the Commission, if supported by substantial evidence, would be conclusive and binding on the courts.

5. The bill directs the Commission to conduct a continuing survey of opportunity and other training programs to determine unlawful employment practices. The Commission would have access to any record maintained by the employers.

6. This bill would place a substantial measure of enforcement within the authority of the Commission, whereas until title VII the enforcement is in the hands of the Attorney General.

Gentlemen, it may well be that changes in the civil rights law of 1964 will be necessary, but this bill is not the answer. We agree with Representative Glenn Andrews who stated: "This bill is ill-timed and unnecessary."

We call on you today to study carefully the far-reaching effects H.R. 10065 will have on Alabama employers, labor organizations, or joint labor management committees. The fact that title VII has been in effect only 7 months indicates the prematureness of such action. Employers are complying with "good intent." The Commission is just beginning to function, and any further legislation could very easily impede desired compliance.

We are confident that your decision will be that this bill is not in the best interest of the people of Alabama.

PRESENT TITLE VII PROBLEMS

We, in AIA, would like to request that you, our Representatives, watch carefully those investigative activities of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, whereby representatives of this Commission "read into" title VII requirements over and above those as set out by the law—specifically requesting the placement of women into impractical job positions and in investigating "group general" complaints instead of specific charges.

REA Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget for fiscal 1967, recommending a reduction of $435 million from the $672 million REA Director Norman M. Clapp had requested, is not only serious, but at the same time the President has impounded $132 million presently unspent but seriously needed by REA for 1966.

This is no time to cripple REA when communication lines and extensions are urgently needed to provide electrical distribution to the farms of South Dakota and the Nation.

If the administration were actually making this cut in an effort to economize, then I would recommend that we tighten our belts and go along, but while he is cutting the heart out of REA and the farmer generally, he is asking for millions to pay the rent for city dwellers whose incomes vastly exceed the annual incomes of most farmers.

I shall continue to fight to help bring the farm standard of living up to somewhere near the standard of those the President would subsidize with rent payments from the Federal Treasury.

Globe-Democrat Publisher Speaks on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard H. Amberg, the outstanding editor and publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, spoke recently on developments in Vietnam, before the meeting of the American Association of University Women in Springfield, Mo.

Mr. Amberg's remarks were carried in the Drury College Mirror, of Springfield, Mo., and because they are so pertinent to the present situation, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article at this point in the Record:

Vietnam Is Topic of Trustee's Talk

(By Scott Chalmers)

Richard H. Amberg, editor and publisher of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat since 1955, and a member of the board of trustees of Drury College, spoke on developments in Vietnam Wednesday night at the annual joint meeting of the University Club and the American Association of University Women.

The meeting was held in the VIP Room at the Lampliter Motor Hotel.

In his speech Amberg advocated that the United States should continue and strengthen its policy in Vietnam. He condemned past policy of this country's leaders, including President Johnson and his position of a few months ago, which he said was to refuse to take a positive and determined stand as to what this country was going to do in Vietnam.

Amberg said, "We have three alternatives: pull out entirely, negotiate, or win the war." He pointed out the troubled situation and precarious geographical location in which Vietnam is situated.

Red China immediately to the north and the revolutionary unrest present in Indonesia located to the south, combine to put Vietnam in a critical position overlooking the important Malacca Straits that are the vital supply routes for virtually all of southeast Asia, he explained.

From these facts he pointed out that a fatal mistake that could result if we pulled out, letting down our few friends in this area of the world and leaving it vulnerable to Communist domination.

Since there is really no government to negotiate with and since they negotiate only by requesting that we "get out," the reasonable alternative is to "win the war."

By win the war Amberg declares that we should take a stand and fight for total victory or "at least until we can negotiate on reasonable terms."

To do this he said we need to go ahead and blockade ocean supply routes, bomb missile sites and Hanoi, where industrial supply complexes are centered. He also called it, "Immoral for our friends such as Canada to sell wheat to Red China, freeing laborers to work in arms factories, which supply the Vietcong."

He stated that "to be successful you need to be strong." Historically speaking he noted that history is on the side of countries that think there is salvation in strength. "To win," he said, "we must have the determined will to win."

Mr. Amburg does not advocate a wider war effort that would extend into North Vietnam. He wants the United States to only secure South Vietnam, where our commitments lie and perhaps use air strikes north of the 17th parallel to sever supply routes to the south. "Let North Vietnam do what it wants."

Mr. Amberg and the paper he heads both are determined battlers against Communist elements. While not calling any of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations Communist inspired, he called them actions that indirectly "prolong the war, and add fuel to anti-U.S. propaganda machines."

Although the Wednesday night audience's applause voiced their agreement with his views on the developments in Vietnam, he and the Globe-Democrat recently came under fire from Washington University's newspaper, Student Life.

On the front page of the Globe, a story linked Theodore Rosebury, professor of bacteriology in the Washington University Dental School with "Communist infiltrated and exploited teach-ins."

Amid exchanges of front page editorials and stories in the Student Life, Amberg stated that, "In all fairness I do not feel that our faithful reporting of the news and our criticism of disgraceful Communist tactics, whether they apply to Aptheker, one of the leading Communists in the country, Rosebury * * * or the criticism of American foreign policy by fringe student groups or by university professors, warrants the description used of this great newspaper, (Globe), by Randy Flachsbart, editor in chief of Student Life, even by a juvenile."

Changes in Public Laws 815 and 874

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would amend Public Laws 815 and 874 in order to bring them more in line with their original purpose.

These laws had their genesis in late 1949 and early 1950 when the Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted extensive hearings all across the country, the printed record of which extends to some 2,400 pages. In the report of that committee, it was stated that—

> Federal assistance as called for in these recommendations is restricted to meeting the Federal responsibility only in these affected school districts; it is not intended to provide assistance that would be available under proposals for general Federal aid.

Over the years since 1950, however, due largely to various amendments, the program has become a kind of general aid to education, "under a poor formula" as one authority put it. While I would be opposed on principle to a Federal program of general aid to education, if we are to have such a program it should be drawn up, introduced, and debated on its own merits. It should not be foisted off on this Congress and on the public by hacking up, amending, and distorting a bill designed to meet a limited and specific problem. It is with an eye toward eliminating some of the more serious inequities and unjustifiable provisions of these laws that I am proposing the following changes.

ELIMINATE ONE-HALF OF NATIONAL AVERAGE CONTRIBUTION RATE

First of all, my bill would eliminate the one-half of national contribution rate as an alternative basis for computing the "local contribution rate." At present, the local school district can use as its "local contribution rate" any one of three different figures—the amount spent per pupil from local revenue sources in "generally comparable" school districts within the State, one-half of the State average per pupil cost, or one-half of the national average per pupil cost in the continental United States.

This latter alternative should be eliminated since—

> Such a rate bears no reasonable relation to the revenue losses or financial burdens occasioned for a particular school district by Federal property tax exemption. Its effect, indeed, is a Federal payment of the full cost per "A" category pupil to many school districts which receive in addition substantial State aid for these same pupils. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

The original purpose behind the one-half of national average contribution rate was to make the payments to school districts throughout the Nation more nearly equal. Before the amendment, there was a very wide discrepancy among payments to school districts in different States. This was due to the fact that Federal payments were based on local contribution rates, and in States where the State contribution to education was high, the local rates were low, and vice versa. It was felt by many to be inequitable for a State which contributed highly to education to be penalized by the terms of the act. Again, however, the present act is being confused with a program of general Federal aid to education.

As was said by Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958:

> The relevant measure is that amount which will put the school district in the same situation as other school districts in the State.

The purpose of Public Laws 815 and 874 is to alleviate the burden caused by Federal activities; its purpose is not to equalize the quality of American education or to provide a gratuitous boon to fortunate school districts. This amendment would save $17 billion.

REDUCTION OF PAYMENTS FOR 3(b) "OUT" CHILDREN

The second change would provide that, in a situation where the parents work on tax-exempt Federal property but live in a school district other than the district in which the property is located, payment for each child would be reduced from 50 to 25 percent of the local contribution rate. Under the existing laws, all "B" category pupils are compensated for at the 50-percent rate, whether the Federal property is located within or without the district of residence. Yet, it is obvious that the burden is greater in the one case than in the other.

When both the Federal property and the residence are in the same school district—the B "in" pupils—school revenue per "B" pupil is cut one-half by reason of the Federal property tax exemption—retaining the other one-half which comes from the residential property. On the other hand, when the Federal property is located outside the district of residence, there is no reduction due to Federal tax exemption. In many States, however, the contribution to local school districts from State tax funds is fairly substantial. Tax-exempt Federal property located anywhere in the State would reduce this State contribution to the local district. To compensate for this reduction, this bill does not entirely eliminate payments for B "out" pupils, but rather provides that they will be compensated for at a rate of 25 percent of the local contribution rate.

In addition, if payments were reduced when the Federal installation is not in the school district, there would be an incentive to consolidate school districts, a procedure generally supported by educators and others who have concerned themselves with the problems of the American school system. This amendment would save $52,411,662.

THREE-PERCENT ABSORPTION REQUIREMENT

A third change would revive the 3-percent absorption requirement. In Public Law 874, as it stood in 1951, it was provided that the school district should absorb a number of federally connected students equal to 3 percent of average daily attendance, the theory being that the Federal installation brings certain benefits to the district which should offset to a certain extent the burden caused by the federally connected pupils. Implementation of this provision was postponed for a year in order to give the local school districts time to prepare for its effects. Yet, when it came time to put this section of the law into effect, the opposition of school district suprintendents throughout the country was loud and vocal, since it would, of course, cut down, or in some cases eliminate, their allotment. As a result, the provision was again postponed and eventually eliminated. In its place, it was provided that there should be a 3-percent eligibility rather than an absorption requirement. Thus, a school district would receive payment for all federally connected pupils as soon as their number reached 3 percent of all pupils in average daily attendance. This provision is both inequitable in its effect and unjustifiable in terms of the original purpose of the laws. It is inequitable in that a district which has 3 percent federally connected pupils is compensated for all of them, while a district with 2.99 percent receives no help at all. What has been done, in effect, is to eliminate the absorption requirement in some cases and retain it in others. If the absorption requirement were revived, this inequitable situation would be remedied.

The provision is unjustifiable, since it fails to take into account the benefits which a Federal installation brings to a community. In the words of M. L. Reese, county manager, Montgomery County, Md., testifying in 1958 before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

> The loss of assessable base resulting from incoming Federal installations is, to a great extent, offset by a general tendency of stimulation to local commerce and area property values.

Reviving the 3 percent absorption requirement would recognize these benefits. This amendment would save $44,111,023.

ELIMINATION OF PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 WHEN PRESCRIBED ELIGIBILITY CONDITIONS ARE NOT MET

A further provision of my bill would eliminate the so-called Purtell amendment. This amendment, approved in 1958, provided that a school district that has met the 3 percent—or 6 percent—eligibility requirement in any year but fails to meet the requirement in the next 2 succeeding years is still eligible for payment for the actual number of federally connected children in average daily attendance in the school district the first year, and for 50 percent of such payment the second year. This is designed to lessen the strain on the school budget which would result from a sudden elimination of Federal funds. With a 3-percent absorption requirement substituted for the present 3-percent eligibility requirement, such a phasing out would, of course, no longer be necessary. The school district would only be receiving payments for those students in excess of 3 percent, not for all students or for none as at present.

Yet, even if the 3-percent eligibility requirement were to be continued, the Purtell amendment could not be justified. According to L. G. Derthick, Commissioner of Education, testifying on June 9, 1959, before the Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor:

> This amendment is manifestly discriminatory as respects a school district which barely meets the 3-percent condition of eligibility in a given year and barely fails to meet that condition in a subsequent year, as against another school district which barely fails to meet such eligibility condition in either year.

Furthermore:

> Such phasing out of Federal payment is unnecessary since Section 3(f) of the law permits a 1-year continuance of payments in the case of a decrease in the number of Federally-connected children for which a school district had reasonably prepared in anticipation of eligibility for Federal payment when such decrease is due to a cessation in Federal activities. (Statement of Francis Keppel, Commissioner of Education, before the Select Subcommittee on Education, House Committee on Education and Labor, Apr. 2, 1963.)

Thus, the Federal Government would aid the local school district only when the need is a direct Federal responsibility. Again, it should be remembered that this is not a general Federal aid to education program based on need, but, rather, it is a limited program to fulfill a specific Federal responsibility. This amendment would save $528,467.

TO PREVENT THE REDUCTION OF STATE PAYMENT TO IMPACTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Finally, there are a number of States that reduce the local school district's entitlement from State funds when these local districts receive aid under the impacted areas program. The State of California is the best example of this. Under California law, 60 percent of the funds received by the local school districts under Public Law 874 are considered to be local resources. Since the State contribution to the local school district is based on the local resources of the district, this provision has the effect of cutting down the State contribution to the local district by an amount equal to 60 percent of their entitlement under Public Law 874. As a result, the Federal Government is not only aiding the impacted school district, but may be providing a form of general aid to education in the State if the State funds that would have been available to the impacted school districts, if they had received no Federal payments, are used for other education purposes in the State.

My bill provides that Public Law 874 payments to the local school district are to be reduced by an amount equal to the reduction in the State entitlement. The State would thus be deterred from reducing its payment to federally impacted school districts.

I firmly believe that if these changes in the impacted areas legislation are adopted, a long step will have been taken toward making these laws both more equitable and more in line with their original purpose.

On Being Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted this morning to read in the January 26 issue of the Washington Post Mr. Joseph Alsop's column sent from Saigon. He so clearly points out the possible increase of sacrifices which our servicemen will undergo as a result of the buildup, both in personnel and materiel, which the North Vietnamese have been able to accomplish during the cessation of bombing. It is almost unbelievable that those conducting the war in South Vietnam would knowingly fail to give our servicemen every possible protection available to this country. I hope this on-the-spot advice will be read by those who seem to feel that this country is not duty-bound to see that our servicemen are protected from every offensive move by the enemy. His column follows:

ON BEING SERIOUS

(By Joseph Alsop)

SAIGON.—From the perspective of Saigon, the noisy month of the President's peace offensive seems a very strange interlude indeed.

Before this reporter left for Vietnam, it had already begun to be hinted here and there in Washington that the peace offensive had been launched in the face of expert warnings that it was likely to do far more harm than good in both North and South Vietnam. This was certainly the case.

Furthermore, the outcome has justified the experts, for much harm has quite visibly been done. Here in the South, in the center of the war effort, dismay, uncertainty and doubt have been implanted.

The South Vietnamese Government was not consulted—indeed, it was hardly informed in advance—about the President's vast venture in mass diplomacy. The neglect of consultation, of course, increased the impact. All sorts of questions were raised, on every side, about the U.S. Government's strength of will and sternness of resolution.

When such questions are asked in South Vietnam, the result is always the same. Instability immediately sets in, and in the spirit of devil-take-the-hindmost, this group or that begins scheming for an antigovernmental group. Thus the promising government, which has maintained stability for the first time since the death of Ngo Dinh Diem, was momentarily endangered.

Fortunately the military directorate, the real core of the government, did not lose its unity. The coup impulse was only felt among certain officers of lower rank. If anything had been attempted, it would not have succeeded. But even the mere attempt would have been deeply, almost irreparably demoralizing.

As it was, the attempt was probably averted only by the calming and reassuring visit of Secretary of State Dean Rusk, which resulted from the infuriated protests about lack of consultation by the Vietnamese Ambassador in Washington, plus the accident of the tragic death of Prime Minister Shastri, of India. This was what lay behind Premier Nguyen Cao Ky's recent dark references to dissident officers.

It was going pretty far, to risk this kind of quite foreseeable trouble in South Vietnam. The risk might have been justified by a real gain in North Vietnam. But the loss in the north has been more grave, by a wide margin, than the loss in the south.

On the one hand, there is the practical loss. Almost without cease since last March, at great peril and cost to the pilots doing the job, the lines of communication in North Vietnam have been hammered by American air attacks. The effects were never so great as the White House and Pentagon sometimes claimed. But by the end of November, the cumulative effect was still very great indeed.

By sheer accumulation of damage and disruption of internal communication and steadily mounting demands for manpower for urgent repairs, the bombing was at last beginning to exert heavy pressure on the whole northern structure. The pause for the peace offensive has allowed all the worst damage to be repaired, new defenses to be moved into place, and huge forward stockages to be built up for added pressure on the South. Thus most of the fruits of the hard effort of the last 8 months have now been thrown away.

Worse still, however, has been what may be called the morale loss in the North. It is a truism that just as the South Vietnamese build their hopes on confidence in America's strength of will, so the North Vietnamese build all their hopes on the belief that America lacks the strength of will to survive the present test. Every Vietnamese expert in the service of the U.S. Government agrees on this point.

Every sign indicates that the peace offensive has strongly bolstered this North Vietnamese belief that they can count on victory in the end, because the United States is basically weak willed.

To be sure, this strange episode is not yet at an end. But it can be predicted with confidence that the North Vietnamese will not negotiate, unless they are secretly assure that the United States will come to the conference table on terms amounting to surrender in advance of the conference.

The North Vietnamese have publicly said as much, in the most unvarnished language. And their main response to the peace offensive has been to push into South Vietnam, with much aid from the bombing pause, more and more of North Vietnamese regular troops. So many are now present in the South that they add up to a major invasion.

It is said, of course, that all the President's senior advisers concurred in the peace offensive, no doubt on domestic political and world opinion grounds in view of the all too accurate expert warnings above noted. But when the country is at war with 200,000 troops in the field, the only serious consideration should be the gains and losses in the war. And as far as the war is concerned, the balance sheet shows no gain and much loss.

School Appropriation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, for the current fiscal year, it is estimated that from $400 to $415 million will be needed to meet all school districts' entitlement. Yet budget figures released Monday called for the appropriation of $183 million to be used during fiscal 1967 for the operation of school districts with students whose parents work on or live on Government installations.

This slash in funds for operation of the federally impacted school program is unjustified, inequitable, and a breach of promise on the part of the Federal Government. It indicates the problems we can anticipate as the Federal Government moves further toward taking over the financing of our schools.

This cut of more than 50 percent will leave many South Dakota school districts far short of necessary funds—funds they had been led to believe they would receive and had included in their budget estimates. They simply had not taken into account the fact that they are at the mercy of the all-powerful centralized Government in Washington whose whim it is to cut these essential funds to make room for more popular programs in this election year.

A Salute to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day in the world, for the Republic of India celebrates the 16th anniversary of her independence. It is a great day in India because the promise of new leadership, in the person of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's new Prime Minister, hopefully will lead this magnificent country into the future with her head held high, full of confidence and enthusiam.

This is an opportune time, therefore, Mr. Speaker, for us here to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, President of the Republic of India; to Her Excellency Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's Prime Minister; and to His Excellency Braj Kumar Nehru, India's Ambassador to the United States.

Upon the shoulders of Mrs. Gandhi have fallen some weighty problems, but her faith in her country and her countrymen will give her the wisdom and guidance she will need to lead this great nation in these times. Our hopes and prayers go out to Mrs. Gandhi at this time. She follows in the illustrious footsteps of the late Prime Minister Shastri—but she, we are sure, will be able to continue the good work of this great man.

We join with our Indian brothers today in commemoration of a landmark in their political history—January 26, 1950, the day upon which the constitution of a free and independent India went into effect. That event marked the establishment of India as a Sovereign Democratic Republic, consisting of a Union of States. It represented a triumph for dedicated Indians who were determined to create a secular democracy in which every person would have the essentials of a decent government and in which inequalities would be reduced to a minimum.

Like our own Bill of Rights, the Indian Constitution named and guaranteed the basic rights of every citizen. It gave the right to vote to everyone 21 years of age and older. The constitution prohibited unequal treatment because of race, religion, social class, sex, or place of birth.

The 16 years that have passed since the Proclamation of the Republic have been as but an instant in the rich history of this 5,000-year-old land. In this period India has grappled heroically with mammoth difficulties. Extreme loyalities of religion and community have been divisive forces, impeding the coalescence of a strong national unity. The Indian economy has been beset with countless problems, in particular the inability to produce enough food for her 465 million people. The ravages of heart-rending poverty, illiteracy, and disease have been etched upon the face of India. The threat of further aggression by the Communist Chinese has added yet another obstacle to the tremendous task of achieving economic self-sufficiency.

Despite these great handicaps, the cumulative effect has been to produce relatively minor distortions in Indian democracy. India today can boast a vigorous press, free trade unions, a growing number of articulate intellectuals, and growing national unity. The ideals of the constitution have been held in reverence, and, more important, have been translated into meaningful action. Having just passed through the crucible of the loss of the great leader Lal Bahadur Shastri, India has again proved the mettle of its democratic system.

Today in this new year of 1966 the democratic way of life stands threatened by Communist aggression. We here in America may take comfort in viewing India as one nation of the vast and teeming Asian land mass that shines forth as a major functioning democracy. To this great land, Mr. Speaker, we send our congratulations and best wishes.

A Time of Bitterness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, sometimes it seems to me that the people of this Nation, and especially the demonstrators against the American policy, or any policy, in Vietnam do not appreciate this Nation's responsibilities to their country.

It has been my experience that the one group of individuals who are absolutely convinced as to the importance of our mission there are the servicemen, who are facing death daily in an effort to preserve freedom for a small part of the world. I believe the following taken from the Chico-Enterprise Record of January 18, 1966, speaks for itself:

> An American serviceman in Vietnam can be excused for being confused about how Americans at home feel about the war. He doesn't like being there in the first place so he is understandably bitter about the anti-Vietnam demonstrations in the United States.
>
> That bitterness is apparent in a poem received recently by Mr. and Mrs. T. L. Arnold of Chico from their Marine Corps son, Hospital Corpsman Lee V. Arnold, who has seen duty in Vietnam but who, at last report, was being treated on Guam for malaria.
>
> The Enterprise-Record doesn't usually print poetry, leaving that to the poetry magazines whose editors are much better judges of poetry than we are. However, feeling expressed in this poem—not the quality of the poetry—prompts us to make an exception to our no-poetry policy.

The poem is entitled "Who Is He."

"You sit at home and watch TV,
You're sipping a refreshing, cold iced tea.
The news comes on and then you hear
The All-Star game is drawing near.
Then you see a far-off land
Where men are dying in the sand.
A frown appears across your face,
You're tired of hearing about that place.
Who cares about Vietnam across the sea,
It's far away and it doesn't concern me.
You'd rather hear the Beatles play
Than learn about the world today.
But stop and think for a moment or two,
And ask yourself, 'Does this concern you?'
It's great to be alive and free.
But how about that guy across the sea?
He's giving up his life for me,
So that I can live under liberty.
He's far away to fight a war
Instead of fighting it at my front door.
This guy who lives in filth and slime,
How can he do it all the time?

"He's about my age so why should he care
About a war someone else should share.
You call him names and make fun of his cause
Yet he's always the first to go and win your wars.
You lucky guy, you just laugh and sneer
Because you've never known fear.
But this brave man faces death each day,
Yet he's always got something funny to say.

"No mail again, a twinge of sorrow,
Oh what the heck; there's always tomorrow.
The morale is low and the tension is high,
Some men even break down and cry.
He wants to go home to see a loved one
But he won't until he gets the job done.
He works all day and stands guard all night,
He's tired and sick but he continues to fight.

"The college crowd thinks he's a fool,
But that is what makes him so hard and cruel.
You don't appreciate the things he will do
Like giving up his life for you.
He sacrifices much, yet asks no return,
Just so you can stay in school and learn.
He believes in freedom and the American way of life,
He'd rather die than live a Communist life.

"No parties and dances for this brave young man,
Until he comes back home again.
The days are hot and the nights too,
What wonders a cold can of beer can do.
He dreams of cold beer and a thick, juicy steak,
Then someone shouts, 'We've got a hill to take!'
Some will be heroes, because they are brave,
And others will just get a wreath on their grave.

"You'll recognize him when he walks by,
There's a saddened look within his eyes.
He walks so proud, yet looks so mean.
He's called the world's greatest fighting machine;
No wonder he's proud; he's a U.S. Marine."

Associated Industries of Alabama Take Stand on Retention of 14(b)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week the Associated Industries of Alabama held its annual Washington meeting. The entire Alabama congressional delegation was privileged to meet with these representatives of the great industries in Alabama and to hear their views on pending legislation. I would like to share some thinking of these keymen in Alabama industry with all the Members of Congress. Following is a statement by Mr. Frank Mattox, southern division manager, of Arvin Industries, Inc., from Fayette, Ala. Mr. Mattox sets forth in clear and understandable language the position of the association on the proposed repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I am especially proud to begin this series with the statement by Mr. Mattox because Fayette is one of the fine communities in the Seventh District of Alabama, the district I have the high honor to represent. Arvin Industries is contributing greatly to the economy of the district and the State, thereby helping all the people. Mr. Mattox's statement follows:

STATEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FIELD, PRESENTED BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, JANUARY 24, 1966, BY FRANK MATTOX

Subject: Retention of section 14(b), National Labor Relations Act.

On behalf of Associated Industries of Alabama's 987 member companies and numerous citizens of Alabama, I congratulate each of our Representatives on his vote to retain section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act.

To you, Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, we are indebted for your active participation in the extended discussion held on this subject and your vote against cloture just prior to adjournment of the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The Associated Industries of Alabama believes that the natural and inalienable right of every person to exercise freedom of choice should be vigorously protected by the agents and agencies of Government at every level of authority.

To assure this freedom of choice, AIA has continuously urged retention of section 14(b) as a part of the Taft-Hartley Act. The following thoughts in support of retention are offered.

REPEAL OF 14(b) WOULD OPEN THE DOOR TO DISCRIMINATION OF THE WORST SORT

This is inconsistent with our Nation's efforts to wipe out discrimination. Is not the administration putting itself in the paradoxical position of sponsoring discrimination against a person in violation of section 8(a)(3) which forbids an employer to discriminate in employment so as to encourage or discourage membership in a labor union?

Is not the administration's effort to repeal 14(b) in conflict with the antidiscrimination principle of this Nation as expressed in title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?

We submit that the enactment of repeal legislation would place the Federal Government in the situation of switching its position from one of antidiscrimination to one of discrimination against the worker in his employment situation.

THE UNIONS USE THE VERY QUESTIONABLE "FREE-RIDER" ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF REPEAL OF 14(b)

This argument seems to be inconsistent because of the fact that the unions eagerly sought and pressured for the privilege to represent all employees in an appropriate bargaining unit, regardless of the wishes of the minority employees, who are, in reality, "unwilling passengers."

Why should the unions be given a second big privilege because of their complaint with their first big privilege? Would it not be the better part of wisdom for them to seek changes in Taft-Hartley that would require them to represent only their bargaining-unit members?

THE UNION'S CLAIM THAT RIGHT TO WORK IMPEDES PROGRESS AND PROMOTES LOW WAGES IS OF DUBIOUS VALIDITY

The Bureau of Labor Statistics and other nationally recognized reports show that, in the 10-year period from 1953 to 1963, 3 right-to-work States led the Nation in the rate of new jobs created in business and industry, and that 3 of the top 5 and 7 of the top 10 States in the Nation in rate of gain in manufacturing hourly wage rates were right-to-work States.

Too, isn't it a fact that wages, to a very great degree, are a function of productivity and capital investment, and thus tend to be highest where such investment has been most intense? Regional differences in wage levels, which appear to have little to do with union organization, also enter the wage picture to some degree.

In the final analysis, must not the measure of wages, to be meaningful, be considered in terms of "real wages?" As to whether they are "low or high" must be decided in terms of what the wages will buy.

THE UNIONS CONTEND THAT RIGHT-TO-WORK IS A MISNOMER IN THAT IT DOES NOT GUARANTEE EMPLOYMENT

Granted, but unions cannot guarantee employment either. Productivity and capital investment in an atmosphere of voluntarism create the most dynamic employment opportunities. Restrictions, whether by labor or government policy, cause the employment opportunities to go elsewhere as in the case of jobs associated with steel wire products; that is, nails, barbed wire, et cetera. "Made in Belgium" now appears on many shipments received in the United States; and the job opportunities have gone overseas where, incidentally, there is a widespread dedication to the principle of voluntarism.

UNIONS CONTEND THAT THE MAJORITY WILL SHOULD BE IMPOSED ON ALL

Isn't this an attempt to equate the union with a sovereignty? We have long recognized the rightful place of majority decisions at the various levels of government, but the principle of voluntarism has prevailed otherwise in private organizations. Has the time come when labor unions are to be accorded the status and privileges of a sovereignty?

EXPOSURE TO UNIONS NOTWITHSTANDING, MANY WORKERS CHOOSE NOT TO BELONG

All of the reasons for this choice are not based on a desire to avoid dues and assessments; among the other reasons are:

First, confidence in the leadership of management; second, objections to the union leadership; third, objections to the union policies; fourth, objections due to conscience; fifth, objections based on religion; and sixth, objections to the union in principle.

In fact, 39 million of almost 56 million workers in nonagricultural establishments have not joined unions, and a substantial number of the nonjoiners have had many years of exposure to unionism.

In the event of repeal of 14(b), the union leaders will surely use their new power to insist on (and possibly get) a union shop in every bargaining situation. And those great numbers of employees who have elected to reject the union will be coerced, on pain of losing their employment, into the union fold against their wishes and in violation of their natural right to choose.

EXPANDED UNION PRIVILEGES WILL TEND TOWARD A POWER STRUCTURE THAT WILL SURELY CURTAIL THE PERSONAL FREEDOMS OF ALL AMERICANS

What are the union leaders really after—complete domination of the political, social, and economic life of this Nation? If this is true, repeal of 14(b) will greatly enhance their position of dominance.

Dominance of the several branches of our Federal Government could ultimately bring the administration to the position of "housekeeper" for the AFL–CIO Executive Council.

CONCLUSION

And in conclusion speaking for the Associated Industries of Alabama and a vast majority of Alabama citizens, we are calling on you, Senator HILL and Senator SPARKMAN, and the entire Alabama delegation to continue your efforts in any extended discussion of H.R. 77 to insure the retention of section 14(b).

In Search of a Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. REES
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, January 24, 1966:

WELL, WHAT CAN HE DO?

(By Walter Lippmann)

The reason why the peace offensive failed is most cogently revealed in the Mansfield report on the state of the war. Mr. Johnson has been trying to obtain by propaganda the victory which he has not been able to obtain on the battlefield—that is to say, the acceptance in the whole of South Vietnam of a government which has lost control of a very large part of South Vietnam. The peace offensive was bound to fail, and the grave decisions which the President hoped to circumvent and avoid are now before him.

If he is to make these decisions wisely, he must recognize that in international politics peace settlements are possible only as and when they reflect the real balance of power. In the World War, for example, Churchill and Roosevelt had to settle with Stalin for a Soviet political frontier in the midst of Germany and of Europe. That is where the Red army had arrived when the peace negotiations began. The same principle will hold in Vitenam. There will be no settlement until the terms of peace reflect the military reality.

The President will be disappointed again and again as long as he and Secretary Rusk ask for a settlement which in effect demands that the defeat of the Saigon forces be transmuted at the conference table into a victory for the Saigon forces. Nor should he indulge in any illusion that the informed opinion of mankind really thinks as Secretary Rusk talks merely because American envoys have been politely and sympathetically received in so many capitals.

What then should the President do? It is often said by the President's supporters that his critics propose no alternative to what he is doing. If that was ever true, it is no longer true today. It is not true since the Mansfield report and since the Gavin statement. The President should reduce his war aims, which today are impossibly high in the light of the conditions described in the Mansfield report. He should alter his strategy along the lines proposed by General Gavin, making it a holding operation pending the eventual negotiation of a political settlement.

The Mansfield report shows that Mr. Rusk's objective—the rule of General Ky or his successor over the whole of South Vietnam—is unattainable no matter how much the war is escalated. The burden of disproving the conclusions of the Mansfield report is on those who have been proved wrong about the escalation of last summer, on those who are now asking for another escalation in order to redeem their failure, on those who want to redouble the stakes in order to recoup their losses.

If the Mansfield report contains the truth of the matter, it follows inevitably that our war aims should be reduced and our strategy revised. We should put aside the hopeless task of searching out and destroying the Vietcong, and we should take our stand, as General Gavin advises, on a holding operation in the coastal cities.

This is not a policy for a glorious victory or for some kind of dazzling political triumph. It is no trick for pulling rabbits out of a hat. It is a formula for liquidating a mistake, for ending a war that cannot be won at any tolerable price, for cutting our losses before they escalate into bankruptcy, and for listening to commonsense rather than to war whoops and tomtoms.

Because we are neither omniscient nor omnipotent, we, even we Americans, cannot always win. But I cannot help feeling in my bones that a display of commonsense by a proud and imperious nation would be a good moral investment for the future.

John Watts Day, Fine Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 24, a JOHN WATTS Appreciation Day lunch, sponsored by the Lexington-Fayette County Chamber of Commerce, was given in Lexington, Ky.

Upon this occasion, all of the Members of the Kentucky delegation in the House, Republicans and Democrats alike, sent a joint wire of congratulations and warm good wishes to our highly esteemed colleague, JOHN WATTS, as a way of expressing our own appreciation for his magnificent contribution of distinguished service to his district, the State of Kentucky, and the Nation.

It is a pleasure to include an editorial entitled "JOHN WATTS Day, Fine Idea" from the Lexington Herald, Lexington, Ky.:

JOHN WATTS DAY FINE IDEA

The Lexington-Fayette County Chamber of Commerce has come up with an excellent idea in planning an "Appreciation Day for Congressman JOHN C. WATTS." No Kentucky Representative in recent years is more deserving of this fine tribute to his work in behalf of his district, his State, and his country.

Representative WATTS first went to Washington as the Representative of the Sixth District after winning a special election in April 1951, and has been reelected every 2 years since then. He is an A.B. and law college graduate of the University of Kentucky and is a farmer and banker in Jessamine County. He is perhaps better informed on burley tobacco than any member of either House of Congress and has been recognized for his wide interests in legislation by being named to the all-important Committee on Ways and Means, perhaps the top assignment for the House. He got early legislative training in the Kenutcky Legislature where he served at one time as floor leader for his party.

While he has been identified with the Democratic Party during his political life, Representative WATTS has served all interests and both parties in Washington. He is elected and reelected by the votes of members of both parties and this fact is recognized in the nonpartisan promotion of the testimonial dinner that will be held on January 24. Advance ticket sales attest the great popularity of the Sixth District's Representative and a sellout of accommodations for the 1,000-seat Phoenix convention hall seems assured at this early date.

Representative WATTS always finds time to attend to the requests of his constitutents. He reflects in his voting the opinions of the people who send him to Washington. Too often voters fail to tell their representatives how well they are doing and this testimonial luncheon will let Representative WATTS know that the voters of this district appreciate what he has done and is continuing to do to make this a great country. The chamber of commerce is to be congratulated on its idea.

Half a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, it rarely happens that the Washington Post editorially criticizes this administration and I was quite surprised to read the leading editorial in the January 26 issue. It appears that even the Post can see through the thinly veiled misrepresentations in the budget message. I am delighted that they have called attention to this procedure to their readers. The editorial follows:

HALF A WAR

President Johnson's new budget for the war on poverty is a disappointment to hopes that the President himself has raised. It represents a sharp cut in the plans that the Johnson administration itself had held before cities throughout the country, and a drastic reduction in the goals that the President in his own speeches has enunciated to the Nation.

The new budget can be said to expand the war on poverty only in a narrow and misleading sense. The Office of Economic Opportunity says that it will actually spend $1.2 billion in the current fiscal year, but will spend $1.7 billion in the next fiscal year. It is an increase of nearly 40 percent; is it not?

Unfortunately, this kind of arithmetic conceals the reality of the broad and powerful programs that Mr. Johnson has begun to create. Most of these programs have begun actual operation only since the beginning of this fiscal year, last July 1. Since they were spending next to nothing at the beginning of the summer, and since they will have spent $1.2 billion by the end of next spring, obviously they will be spending at a much higher annual rate by the end of the fiscal year. In fact, the OEO will have to cut existing programs to hold its expenditures to the figure that the President has set.

The whole OEO operation has been run on the assumption, until very recently, that its budget would be approximately doubled next year. The President's figure—including the alleged increase—is the bare amount essential to keep it from collapsing. To maintain even this figure, it will probably be necessary to finance some of the OEO's present educational activities with the money provided by the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The effect of this retardation of the poverty program is best understood by examining specific cities. Detroit, which is embarked on an immensely promising plan, will spend less than $10 million in OEO funds this year. But it is building toward an annual level of about $20 million. If its progress is cut off at this point, it will remain perilously incomplete. None of the OEO money for manpower training, for example, has yet arrived in Detroit; but a poverty program that cannot train men for jobs is a disaster. Detroit, like other cities, has discovered that the slums are in desperate need of modern health services, and intends to put clinics into each of its four community action centers. The OEO has even been pushing Detroit to expand this proposal. An OEO inspection team looked at the city last fall and forcefully recommended a very substantial enlargement of the clinic system. Nearly $1 million of the cost has been obligated, but very little of it has been spent because the first clinic has just opened.

After community action in the cities, the most expensive and controversial of the OEO's enterprises is the Job Corps. President Johnson said in his message on poverty, less than 2 years ago, "A new national Job Corps will build toward an enlistment of 100,000 young men." The new budget calls for an enlistment of 45,000. As recently as last September, President Johnson announced the expansion of Project Head Start and declared that it would institute "year-round centers for 3-year-olds and up. We expect to enroll 350,000 needy children in the first year." The new budget will permit only 200,000.

"We are citizens of the richest and most fortunate nation in the history of the world," the President said in his original message on poverty. That is still true. "The new program I propose is within our means," he then said. And that also still is true. But the program that is projected in the new budget does not reflect either of these truths.

New Opportunities in Education—Shall We Grasp Them?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. OLIVA HUOT

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial comment appeared in the January 21, 1966, edition of the Carroll County Independent of Center Ossipee, N.H. I believe this editorial brings out in an excellent manner the feeling of a great majority of New Hampshire citizens regarding Federal assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This editorial was signed by Mr. A. H. Chapman of Chocorua, N.H.

NEW OPPORTUNITIES IN EDUCATION—SHALL WE GRASP THEM?

The Education Act of 1965 is raising some curious speculations and some hot issues. As of this writing, 64 New Hampshire towns have had to decide whether to accept or reject Federal funds made available under title 1 of the act.

Title 1 provides money so that the local primary and secondary schools may obtain facilities and undertake procedures which are aimed at special training of youngsters who, for a variety of reasons, are unable to make normal progress. It is within this group that dropouts are most likely to occur. Their backwardness in learning also serves to retard the progress of their more fortunate classmates. Clearly, the application of carefully tailored techniques can vastly improve the general level of educational achievement, and at the same time overcome the frustration and heartbreak of the slow learners.

Ever since Lincoln signed the Land Grant College Act in 1862, the Federal Government has continually made funds available to local education. Thus the passage of the 1965 Education Act is by no means an innovation. In New Hampshire, the most recent Federal contribution is about 6 percent of total school expense. The Federal action is paternalistic rather than political; it provides aid to victims of social inequities for which the Federal Government rightly feels a responsibility.

Of the 64 towns which have already voted, 56 have accepted and 8 have rejected the title 1 funds. Though this result indicated the general acceptability of the plans provided for in the Act, some of the 8 towns which voted "No" have based their action on inexcusable misinformation and unfounded predictions that—"The Federal Government aims to take over control of our schools."

On the question of control, it is significant to read section 604 of the act which states, "Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration of personnel of any educational institution or school system." This section forcefully refutes the misleading implications contained in a 1961 memorandum issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is a great deal of difference between a Bureau memorandum and a law of the land.

Furthermore, the act clearly states that the State education department and the local school authorities shall retain full responsibility for the designation of methods and facilities, and for complete administration of the programs. All the Federal Government asks is that well-recognized standards be maintained and that the local authorities undertake to evaluate the success of their programs.

The critics may get some kind of satisfaction from accusations that the Congress of the United States is trying to invade our villages, brainwash our educators, and pervert our school kids. The real victims of these critics, however, are the needy and handicapped children in eight of our towns who are thoughtlessly being deprived of educational benefits which—because of our inadequate tax system—we are unable to provide ourselves.

A. H. CHAPMAN,
Chocorua, N.H.

John Borland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, during the period of time while the 89th Congress was in recess, a fine friend and an outstanding newspaperman for whom I had the greatest respect died unexpectedly in Connecticut. I want to pay tribute to him now, and to call the details of his career and the fine standards he set to the attention of the House.

Jack Borland covered the State capitol in Hartford, and many sessions of the general assembly, with skill, ability, and dedication. He displayed some of the innate caution toward the fine men who have served in those bodies, but withal he respected the hard work and effectiveness with which they served.

I want to extend my deepest sympathies to his fine son, who was serving in the Vietnam area when death took Jack from us, and to his widow and the family.

I offer the account of his death for the RECORD:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Nov. 22, 1965]

JOHN K. BORLAND, JR.

As a veteran member of this newspaper's team of State government reporters, Jack Borland was one of the best-known newspapermen in Connecticut. It would be stressing the obvious to say that he was well liked—his ready smile, his quiet voice with its persistent Pennsylvania accent, his kindness and integrity made him both popular and respected.

His work put him into close association with men and women of position, with politicians on their way up or down the ladder, and he acquired a gentle skepticism about them that enabled him to recognize the human being behind the title and the ceremony surrounding it.

When he was not busy on his beat or at his typewriter, he could often be found in the sports department. His favorite sport was football. It amused and pleased him that his own small college, Washington and Jefferson, had once played in the Rose Bowl. He was walking to his seat at a game at Storrs on Saturday when he died.

The vacancy he leaves in our affections will remain, and we shall miss, too, his professional competence and dependability as a newspaperman.

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Times, Nov. 22, 1965]

TIMES' J. K. BORLAND DIES—RITES WEDNESDAY AT 1

Funeral services for John Kelso (Jack) Borland, Jr., 52, veteran Hartford Times State capitol reporter who died on Saturday, November 20, 1965, will be held Wednesday at 1 p.m., at the Burnside Methodist Church, East Hartford.

Mr. Borland was stricken as he was about to enter the University of Connecticut Memorial Stadium to watch the University of Connecticut-Holy Cross game at Storrs and died almost immediately.

He lived at 5 Higbie Drive, East Hartford.

The Rev. G. Albin Dahlquist, pastor of the church, will officiate. Burial will be in Hillside Cemetery, East Hartford.

"Jack," as he was known, joined the Times staff 20 years ago, in August 1945. A year later, he was given the State capitol beat and stayed with it ever since.

Born in Washington, Pa., August 4, 1913, he was the son of the late John K. and Grace Brownlee Borland. He was a graduate of East Washington High School in 1932 and in 1936, a graduate of Washington and Jefferson College, where he was active on student publications.

From 1937 to 1941, he was an English and debating teacher at a suburban Pittsburgh high school, working summers in steel mills and glassmaking plants in the area.

Mr. Borland came to wartime Hartford in 1941 and worked the next 4 years as an inspector at Pratt & Whitney Aircraft. In 1942 he began part-time reporting for the Times.

Particularly interested in economics and government affairs, he was happiest when he could dig into a good State financial story.

Mr. Borland felt an obligation to keep a sharp eye on State agency operations to protect the taxpayer.

"You can't expect the politicians to police each other," he was fond of saying. "Both sides have too much on the other. The press must enlighten and expose."

In a 1960 publication, he stated: "The more of government that can be opened to public view, the better the government." And he dedicated himself to opening this view.

Mr. Borland took particular satisfaction when he wrote a series of stories in 1953 to arouse taxpayers over longstanding State car abuse and "the State car racket."

As a result of the series, former Gov. John Lodge cracked down, ordering a new rigid set of standards for use of State cars.

His State capitol coverage concentrated on finance and tax offices, and he prided himself in making his stories easily understandable to the reader.

Mr. Borland, who most recently covered the constitutional convention, had been covering gubernatorial press conferences since 1946. About Governors, he used to say:

"I have liked each one. Each has tried honestly to do a good job, often suffering political consequences as a result."

For relaxation, he enjoyed sports, other outdoor activities, and gardening.

Mr. Borland was a past president of the State Capitol newsmen's Laurel Club.

He also was a member of the Association of Political and Legislative Reporters, the 20-year Club of the Hartford Times, the Burnside Methodist Church, and the men's club of the church.

He leaves his wife, Mrs. Jane Cowden Borland; two sons, Lt. (j.g.) J. Bradford Borland, with the Navy in Vietnam, and Douglas K. Borland at home; a daughter, Miss Beverly B. Borland at home, and a sister, Mrs. David W. Weaver, of Baltimore, Md.

Friends may call at the Newkirk and Whitney Funeral Home, 318 Burnside Avenue, East Hartford, Tuesday, from 2 to 5 and 7 to 9 p.m.

Memorial contributions may be made to the Memorial Fund of the Burnside Methodist Church or to a charity of the donor's choice in his memory.

Governor Dempsey said today he was "deeply distressed by the death of Jack Borland whom I have known for more than 15 years both as a friend and as a reporter dedicated to keeping the readers of the Hartford Times fully informed of the news of the legislative and executive branches of State government.

"He was a veteran member of the capitol press corps whose loss will be keenly felt by his paper, his readers, and his many friends and acquaintances in official State circles.

"My most sincere sympathy is extended to his widow and children."

Hawaii Reaps Benefits From Matson's Containerization Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, America is known for its eagerness to encourage and promote new ideas, whether it be in private industry or in government. The people of Hawaii are presently reaping the rewards of this pioneer spirit in the shipping industry.

The Matson Navigation Co., by experimenting—as far back as 1958—with containerization, has made it possible for Hawaii's importers to save a large percentage of shipping costs.

"Containerization" means shipping by container. The goods to be shipped are packed and sealed in containers at the point of origin and the containers are not opened until they reach their destination, irrespective of the different modes of transportation employed en route. Containerization has reduced insurance costs because of a marked reduction in damage and pilferage. Loading and unloading costs, too, have been greatly reduced as the ship's time in port has been shortened.

Honolulu Advertiser's business editor, Emil A. Schneider, citing from the Kaiser Steel Corp. periodical Westward, says that containerization has been partly responsible for Matson's great increase in overall tonnage from 210,000 in 1958 to 700,000 tons in 1965.

Matson, he says, is planning to extend its containerization program to the Far East. Thus, Hawaii can look forward to a still wider variety of commodities at reasonable cost from all over the world.

I commend to the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article about containerization written by Mr. Schneider and which appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 9, 1966:

ISLAND FREIGHT CHARGES CUT BY CONTAINERIZATION

(By Emil A. Schneider)

The people of Hawaii would be paying one-third more in freight charges for cargoes from the mainland if Matson Navigation Co. had not adopted its containerization program.

This statement, attributed to a Matson official, is included in an article describing the rapid growth and acceptance of containerization throughout the entire U.S. transportation system. The article is printed in Westward, periodic pamphlet published by Kaiser Steel Corp.

"Shipping by container," the article says, "can mean an average saving of 15 percent for the shipper, and savings double that have been recorded."

One of the principal savings, the article notes, stems from speeding up loading and unloading operations.

Containerization, it says, "permits a ship to spend 80 percent of her time at sea—making money. A conventional freighter is in port 50 percent of her lifetime, and time in port is money lost."

In addition to eliminating expensive multiple handling of cargo, it adds, containers have greatly reduced cargo damage and pilferage. This in turn has led to lower insurance costs, it notes.

Also, the article points out, "containers eliminate the need for conventional steamship packaging of export items, making them more competitive in the foreign market."

The author, Fred Reicker, describes containerization as "a beautiful blend of rugged durability, efficiency, and versatility." He refers to containers as "footloose warehouses" because once packed, the container remains sealed until it reaches the consignee, regardless of how many different modes of transportation may be used throughout the container's journey.

He notes that containers can carry a wide variety of cargo—dry, refrigerated, liquid, even livestock.

Reicker cites such examples as refrigerated meats and produce to Hawaii, grains to Latin America, bourbon to Hong Kong, radios to America, cookies to Germany, "top secret" Paris originals to Chicago, and radar components to an isolated Alaskan outpost.

He adds that containerization is spreading rapidly throughout the railroad and trucking industries as well as the steamship industry, and experts expect it to mushroom in the years ahead.

The article says that as much as containerization has grown to date, it still accounts for only 2 percent of the Nation's freight that can be containerized.

"Sooner or later, the advantages of the container will bring us that other 98 percent," a shipping official is quoted as saying.

One estimate, the article says, is that the 300,000 containers—8 feet and longer—now in use in the United States will double by 1975.

Foster Weldon, Matson's research vice president, expressed growth possibilities of containerization in this way:

"During 1966, each of our 6,000 containers will make over 10 round trips to support a community of 800,000 in Hawaii. Just apply these figures to any major population center in the United States and you have a rough idea of containerization's future."

The article notes that Matson started its container program as a modest experiment in August 1958.

"The experiment blossomed into an overwhelming success, and the company now has a fleet of 7 specialized container vessels providing 60,000 container round trips a year between the west coast and the islands," it adds.

Recently, Matson applied to expand its container program to the Far East on a nonsubsidized basis. The application currently is pending before Federal maritime authorities.

The article adds that American President Lines of San Francisco (which also serves Hawaii) already has 420 containers in use in its Far Eastern shipping service. The containers are carried by four APL ships, two of which have been specially equipped to carry both containers and general cargo, it says.

APL soon will add 1,000 more containers to its container inventory, the article notes.

A containerization leader on the east coast, the article says, has been Sea-Land Service, Inc., a steamship firm that operates a coastal shipping service around the continental United States and also serves Central America and the Caribbean area.

Sea-Land, it adds, has 11,000 containers in use, and plans to purchase 6 new container ships. Each will be able to carry 1,200 containers. The firm plans to use some of the new vessels on a proposed New York-Europe run.

The article points out that "almost all shippers agree a container is a moneymaking machine," but adds that there is considerable difference of opinion on container sizes.

For example, it says, APL uses 20-foot containers, Matson prefers 24-foot lengths, and Sea-Land uses mostly 35-footers and will add 40-foot units. A variety of other sizes also are in use.

The article quotes Matson's Weldon as saying that Matson studied all practical container lengths from every aspect—economy, capacity and flexibility.

"The 24-foot unit proved to be best for our Hawaiian trade.

"In my opinion," he adds, "standard size increments are impractical. Container sizes should be governed by the economies of a particular trade. Then equipment, compatible with whatever that size may be, will have to be developed.

"Transportation will have to specialize to achieve maximum economy in particular trades, just as industry specializes for particular markets."

Containerized cargo also is causing considerable upheavals at ports where this kind of cargo is handled, the magazine notes.

J. F. Parkinson, assistant general manager of the Port of Los Angeles, notes that containerization has meant an initial drop in income for many west coast ports.

"Before containerization," he says, "wharfage rates were based on either a dimension or weight basis. Rates calculated on dimension usually resulted in a good income. Container rates, determined solely by weight, are somewhat lower and mean less income.

"The resulting savings, however, have been passed along to the manufacturer, who can now afford to ship items which were once marginal in profit.

"Consequently," he adds, "overall tonnage across the pier has increased."

Tonnage has jumped at the ports of Oakland and Long Beach, the article says.

Matson's tonnage, for example, has jumped from 210,000 tons in 1956 to a current 700,000 tons at its terminals at Alameda in the Bay area. Volume in 1966 is expected to reach 800,000 tons, the article says.

An Oakland port executive is quoted:

"Intercoastal trade was dead before Sea-Land established its facility here 3 years ago. Each year since, this operation has brought a quarter-million tons of business to us."

To accommodate anticipated increases in containerization in the future, the article says, San Francisco is developing a 60-acre, $27 million container dock at its Army St. Terminal. The facility is scheduled to be ready for use late this year.

Address of Paul Hall, President, the Seafarers International Union, Before the Japanese Labor Confederation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective labor leaders in the trade movement unions is Paul Hall, president of the Seafarers International Union.

Last week Mr. Hall addressed the Japanese Labor Confederation at its second national convention, which opened in Tokyo on January 18. Mr. Hall, in the finest tradition of American labor, made a strong plea in his address for the elimination of poverty and social injustice and for the continuation of the free world's struggle against Communist imperialism.

It is with pleasure that I commend his remarks to our colleagues.

The address follows:

Text of President Hall's Speech Before Japanese Confederation of Labor

It is indeed a great pleasure to be here with you today. It is a privilege to bring you fraternal greetings from President Meany, the officers and executive council, and the more than 13 million members of the AFL–CIO. In so doing, I emphasize again the bonds of friendship that already bind our two labor organizations, a friendship that was dramatized by the appearance of President Meany leading the American delegation to your founding congress in November 1964. The AFL–CIO regards Domei as its counterpart organization in Japan, as the representative of democratic trade unionism in your country.

It is natural for me, as president of the Seafarers International Union, to add special greetings to my colleagues of "Kaiin," the "All Japan Seamen's Union" of Domei, which has been engaged during this period in a sharp struggle with the Japanese shipowners for the betterment of the conditions of the seamen. Considering the difficulty and danger of the work of seamen, the demands of the union are just. I assure you most heartily of my sympathy and support in your struggle.

Japan is the most dynamic and industrially developed country in Asia. It is destined to play an increasingly important role in the affairs of Asia and the world. Indeed, it is necessary that Japan do so, for it has much that it can teach, much which it can help the less economically advanced countries, especially in Asia.

In this important and inspiring task, Domei, the democratic labor movement of Japan, can play a significant role in advancing the cause of freedom and social justice. Perhaps more than any other Asian labor movement, Domei is in a position to do this by virtue of its experiences and international responsibility. Indeed, Domei has for a long time been aware of its duty in helping others, and your leaders have already expended much time and energy in activities outside the borders of your own country. Brother Takita, is your representative to the executive board of our international organization, the ICFTU, and head of the textile section of the Asian Regional Organization (ARO) of our ICFTU. Brother Wada is president of the ARO. There are, I know, plans under consideration by Domei to extend its aid in certain spheres of endeavor. For all this, Domei and its leaders deserve the greatest credit.

MUTUAL GOOD WILL

Our two countries are very friendly. That is as it should be. That friendship must continue. Indeed, it must be deepened and strengthened. The continuance of that friendship is a guarantee of the strength of the democratic idea and the cause of human freedom. Economically, our two countries need each other. To date, our economic relationship is beneficial to both countries, for we are each other's largest market for products. True, there are trade problems, even differences over trade and other problems that arise periodically. This is natural and inevitable. But in democratic societies, these differences can be discussed with mutual good will and tolerance. They never need create insuperable obstacles to good relationships, for certainly what binds our two countries together is deeper and more fundamental than any disagreements which may arise.

We realize that you are engaged in a continuous struggle to raise the living standards of your members. That is the central function of a trade union organization. The working people of every country must have a just and adequate share of the wealth they produce. There is no excuse for misery and poverty or social injustice in the 20th century, especially in these days of great technological advance, where we have the capacity to produce enough for everybody. Yet, in spite of this, because of the lack of social vision and moral concepts of human decency still existing in the minds of too many of our employers, we still have millions of people existing on the edge of poverty, too many millions actually starving and bereft of all hope.

It is the age-old struggle of trade unions to improve conditions and to do away with inhuman conditions of suffering in a society of potential abundance. That is your struggle and it is our struggle also. We have sectors of poverty in our country, although we have made great progress in improving the living conditions of our members. Unemployment, though declining, is still too big in our country, due to the inroads of automation. This problem of automation has not to date been handled satisfactorily in our country. Automation must not be allowed to be an end in itself. It must be subordinated to the human needs of the members of society. A comprehensive program must be worked out which can help us realize the productive potential of advanced technology, but which can safeguard and enhance the living standards of the workers. The AFL–CIO has such a program, and is spending much time and energy in its promotion. Our Government and the employers are being coached by the labor movement to take appropriate and effective action.

EQUAL HUMAN RIGHTS

The AFL–CIO is also in the forefront of the fight against any kind of racial discrimination. We are for equal rights—economic—political and social—to be granted to every citizen of our country, no matter the color of his skin, national origin or religion. In this struggle it is right and just to say that our Government officially and energetically is working overtime in the cause of civil rights and human justice to eradicate as rapidly as possible the remnants of discrimination. And the great majority of American people are with us in the struggle.

What I said before about the relation between our countries is true also of the relations between our two trade union movements. We may not see eye to eye on everything, but what binds us together is fundamental and strong. I remind you, in this connection, of what President Meany said in his address to the historic founding Congress of Domei:

"What is decisive is that we must meet the common dangers and tasks. What is most important is that we share a common faith in freedom and peaceful progress. Whatever differences might arise can and should be resolved in a spirit of serving best our mutual interests. I am sure that close and expanding cooperation between the Japanese and American labor movements would go a long way toward insuring a relationship between both our countries based on mutual confidence, equality and justice."

That our two movements share a common faith in freedom, democracy and peaceful progress is certain. We both understand that the measure of a strong democratic society is a strong free trade union movement. That is why our two movements are resolutely opposed to all dictatorial, antidemocratic groups and ideologies. That is why we have together fought against the maneuvers and aggressive acts of Communist totalitarianism, the new imperialism. We can see their intent to subvert and destroy democratic societies, both from without and within, whether they are stable and fully developed or struggling to attain stability as in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa.

If a world of peace and freedom is to be built, these attempts of Communist imperialism must be beaten back. We are certain that Domei and the AFL-CIO will stand shoulder to shoulder together in fighting against colonialism, whether of the old brand or the new and even more dangerous kind of Communist imperialism, whether its headquarters be in Moscow or Peiping; to help the cause of national independence and human rights wherever it may be in need.

The world needs peace more than anything else. Who more than workers desire it deeply or can benefit more by it? The free trade unions have always worked for a world peace of freedom. But we want a just peace. With all the difficulties of achieving it, we must nevertheless be realistic and responsible in our approach. Emoting shouting of slogans in the streets do not help at all. Lasting peace can be achieved by effective international inspection and suspension, not only of nuclear weapons, but also all other weapons of mass destruction. I cannot stress too strongly that real and total disarmament, which is our common objective, can be attained only through such international inspection and control. Let us work together for this great goal.

I wish you success in your deliberations. I am sure they will lead to benefits for your members and strengthen the forces of democracy in Japan.

Head Start Becomes Key to the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM GIBBONS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Record a very excellent article from the Washington Star of January 25, entitled "Head Start Becomes Key to the Future." I commend it to the reading of all of the Members:

CHANCE TO CATCH UP—HEAD START BECOMES KEY TO THE FUTURE

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK.—Operation Head Start, the far-reaching project to provide schooling for underprivileged preschool children, has proved successful. Started as a summer program, it has now been developed into a year-round operation, financed by the Federal Government at a cost of millions of dollars.

Last summer, 561,000 children throughout the Nation were enrolled. President Johnson called it a landmark, "not just in education, but in the maturity of our own democracy."

When Project Head Start was announced, its sponsors wanted to provide preschool centers in which each child would have the opportunity to develop to his full potential. It is known that the early years of childhood are critical. A pattern of failure often develops among the children in poverty homes. This follows them into the schools, with resultant failures, dropouts, and intellectual handicaps.

The summer program, those responsible for it believe, succeeded in helping preschoolers improve their health, develop self-confidence, increase their verbal skills, and bring the home and school closer together.

The program cost $95 million, of which $83 million came from Federal antipoverty funds. More than 40,000 professional workers were employed at 13,344 centers. They were assisted by 45,000 neighborhood residents and 250,000 unpaid volunteers. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, R. Sargent Shriver, called it the greatest voluntary effort in peacetime this country has ever known.

As one byproduct, the medical examinations uncovered 100,000 cases of eye difficulties, 50,000 cases of partial deafness, 30,000 cases of nutritional deficiency, and 75,000 cases of nonimmunization.

The year-round Head Start centers are now underway in many parts of the country. President Johnson has estimated that 350,000 needy children, from 3 to 5 years of age, would be enrolled in the first sessions, and many more within the next 5 years. The President said that follow-up programs such as special classes, home visits, and field trips would be provided to sustain the progress made by children enrolled in Head Start.

However, the schools must provide equal education opportunities for all children. It is known that in many underprivileged areas, the children who need the best schools have the poorest. It is difficult, for example, to get experienced teachers to remain in poorly equipped schools, or schools in needy neighborhoods.

Kindergarten and first-grade teachers have complained that some of the benefits of Project Head Start are being lost by overcrowded, underequipped public school classes. However, it is expected that a substantial part of the $1 billion Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary School Act of 1965 will provide special educational programs to help the children in underprivileged communities.

The implications of this program go beyond the antipoverty aspects. Millions of underprivileged children may, upon entering school, be able to keep up with their more fortunate classmates. The 1 or 2 years of preschool education will offer the youngsters confidence in their relations with people, and will—in the best sense of the term—provide them with a headstart toward learning.

Ukrainian Independence

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join in the observance marking the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine, which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918. Although that freedom was short lived, that important event, the proclamation of Ukrainian independence and the establishment of the Republic, symbolized the realization of a centuries-old dream.

The Ukrainians are one of the oldest and largest of the Slavic ethnic groups. They are known as one of the most peace-loving, industrious, and democratic peoples in Eastern Europe. For centuries they have been denied the benefit of these wonderful traits by the oppressive measures inflicted upon them by the Russians.

During all these centuries, the Russians were not able to eradicate Ukrainian nationalist feelings. The idea of complete freedom has always been nurtured in the people's hearts.

Today, Communist totalitarian tyranny has turned the Ukraine into a large prison camp in which more than 42 million freedom-seeking and hard-working Ukrainians are crushed under the yoke of the Soviets. There is no freedom of movement, and no freedom of expression. However, the Ukrainians in the free world, and particularly those in the United States, observe each year on January 22, Ukrainian Independence Day, with due solemnity.

Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Americans in bringing congratulations to the Ukrainian people, and in the hope that the freedom we enjoy in the United States can become a way of life for all the lands now controlled by communism.

Spirit of Freedom: The Ukrainian Genius

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, 48 years ago, on January 22, 1918, the Ukraine broke the chains of Russian rule. This day marked a glorious culmination of the dreams of freedom which Ukrainians had harbored for hundreds of years.

Yet upon gaining independence, the Ukraine was beset from all sides by nations greedy for its abundant natural resources and strategic geographic location. Germany and Austria-Hungary seized the Ukraine and installed a puppet ruler. After its defeat in World War I, Germany withdrew, but the French then landed at Odessa in an attempt to bring the Ukraine into France's sphere of influence. White Russians fought through the Ukraine in their efforts to overthrow the Russian Bolsheviks. Poland invaded, trying to annex the Ukrainian lands west of the Dnieper River. Meanwhile the Bolsheviks constantly attacked in order to reannex the Ukraine to Russia. In 1922 the gallant Ukraine was forced to succumb to the strength of the U.S.S.R. and thus lost its last vestige of independence.

Today the beautiful and rich land of the Ukraine stands crushed in the paws of the Russian bear. Even so, Ukrainian patriots have never relinquished the most dominant theme of their national history—the will to be free. The world has witnessed this will many times. After World War II, when the Ukraine lost so much of its wealth, its people never once flinched from the hard task of rebuilding. In the early 1950's Ukrainian nationalist guerrillas still fought against the forces of communism in west Ukraine and Polish-Slovak-Carpathian borderlands. Such is the spirit of Ukrainians that the Russian press has made many attacks on Ukrainian literature for its nationalism.

The man who embodies the spirit of nationalism most perfectly in Ukrainian culture is Taras Shevchenko, poet and national hero. His power was such that his poems in defense of freedom, written in the 19th century, caused the Russian empire to quake and Czar Nicholas I to command him to desist from writing. For the first time a Ukrainian had risen to express the feelings of his people in their own tongue. Earlier writers had made some use of Ukrainian, but Shevchenko worked almost exclusively in his native language, thus placing the literature of his homeland in the ranks of the great Slavic writings.

In his earlier works Shevchenko idealized the lives of his people, their troubles, and their bitter struggles to gain independence. His words are still cherished by Ukrainians, who, just as Shevchenko chafed under the rule of czarist Russia 100 years ago, dream today of attaining freedom from the Russian Communists.

On this day it is fitting that we pay tribute to the genius of the Ukrainian people—their undying will to be independent and to take their rightful place among the free nations of the world. As Americans we must ever remember that as long as courageous Ukrainians remain under tyrannical Russian rule, as long as any nation remains subjugated to another, as long as men are denied the ideals of democracy and individual liberty, our task is not done. It is my privilege today, Mr. Speaker, to salute the Ukraine and all its valiant sons throughout the world.

Longer Terms for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 12, 1966, issue of the Columbus (Ind.) Evening Republican evaluating the President's proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives:

LONGER TERMS

There are several good arguments for lengthening the terms of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, but no good argument for giving them 4-year terms concurrent with the election of the U.S. President.

Supporters of President Johnson's request for a constitutional amendment to change the Representatives' terms from 2 years to 4 can argue that Members of the House must spend too much time campaigning and that they cannot concentrate on legislative work.

But there is only one argument for election of the Representatives every 4 years at the same time the President is elected and that is a bad one. It is the argument that there are larger turnouts of voters in the presidential election years. It could be expected to result in a House heavily influenced if not completely dominated by Members carried into office on the coattails of the successful presidential candidate. This would only result in making the House more of a rubber stamp than it is now turning out to be, further increasing centralization of power in the President's office.

The alternatives, if a 4-year term is decided upon, would be to elect half the Members of the House every 2 years or to elect all of them in the off-presidential election years. In any event they must not all be elected at the same time as the President.

During the drafting of the U.S. Constitution, James Madison of Virginia argued for a 3-year term, as opposed to some who favored a 1-year term and others supporting 2 years. The 3-year term was temporarily adopted, but later changed to 2 years in completion of the Constitution.

A 4-year term was never proposed, the Founding Fathers holding to the idea that the Lower Chamber of Congress must be directly and immediately responsible to the people and if not doing what the people wanted could be replaced within the 2-year election period. There is still nothing wrong with that idea and the only thing to be considered is whether the complexities of modern government do require that Members of the House devote more time to legislative work. If so, why should not a 3-year term be considered instead of 4?

Bob Hope, The Old Trouper, Does It Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men in show business is Bob Hope. This gentleman, during his entire professional career, has devoted innumerable hours, days, and weeks to charity. But one of his really great contributions to our society has been his annual Christmas visit to those places around the world where American servicemen have been stationed and sometimes, as during this past Christmas, fighting and dying.

It is with pleasure that I commend to our colleagues one of the many tributes to Mr. Hope, written upon the televising of excerpts from his most recent trip.

The following review is by Atra Baer and is from the January 20, 1966 edition of the New York Journal American:

BLESS 'EM ALL

(By Atra Baer)

Bob Hope's annual Christmas show—90 minutes culled from 12 days in Vietnam and on stepping-stone islands with haunted names like "Guam"—cannot and will not be reviewed as if it were any other show, any other show at all.

His yearly trips to our fighting fronts and to the distant "hotstove league" outposts where the war may be cold but the powder is being kept warm, are testimony to the state of the world.

Last night's NBC credits should properly have read: "Produced by The Way Things Are; Directed by Democracy; Starring the Audience, the Young Men and the Old Soldiers."

And yearly with this unchanging script, in settings as farflung as they are unvarying, Bob Hope—who doesn't need the money, doesn't need the recognition—can take a one-line vulgarity, updated from the frowziest days of burlesque, and turn it into a hymn. A hymn to the gallantry that is a lonely man's laughter, a frightened man's courage, a wounded man's wholeness. And a hymn to that part of normalcy of individualism, that God knows how stays with men who find themselves where nothing is as they have known it before, where there must be little individualism except in dreams, and where life goes on, or perhaps, does not.

Bob Hope can introduce a shimmering bit of fluff like, "Miss North Cal'ina," graduated to "Miss U.S.A.," Dianna Lynn Batts, and listen while the shyly (actually), intones: "I'm not a performer, but this experience really rounds you out as a person." He can stand there as 6,000 men react to this "innuendo" that is subtle as a tidal wave, react with raucous hoots that might have sent a Sadie Thompson fleeing in tears. But Hope's arm was around her, as she was X-rayed by eyes that were simultaneously seeing 6,000 other women. And it must have been at once an absolutely impersonal and deeply personal thing that this pale-haired junior goddess from home was experiencing. An experience that may really "round her out as a person." The men sat in the slashing rain not moving except to applaud; sat in a vicious downpour, unconcerned and sunny as if they were in the grandstand on a blue-sky doubleheader Sunday back home. Not moving until a GI came onto the platform with a piece of paper. "You read it, I can't do it" said Hope. The GI did: "Will all of 412 report immediately to—" and here and there men get up and walked away from laughter.

When it comes to a cynical realism, Hope has never underestimated his GI audience.

At Guam he assured them: "You boys have a very important job. We wouldn't want the Communists taking over all this grass. I understand you made a very important airstrike the other day, hit that 12-inch pipeline that brings in the soy sauce from Peiping."

The show ended on the decks of an aircraft carrier with Anita Bryant leading the cast—wriggly, white-booted Joey Heatherton, Carroll Baker, Jerry Colonna, Kaye Stevens, Jack Jones, the Nicholas Brothers—in the traditional closing: "Silent Night." And tears for that Christmas Eve had to have blurred millions of screens last night, in January. At home.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, we who love freedom pause to honor the sacrifices and the valor of the people of the Ukraine, in commemoration of the 48th anniversary of their independence. This long-suffering people, whose centuries-old dream of nationhood flowered with such tragic brevity from 1918 to 1920, still aspire to independence and freedom. Numbering some 45 million people, and occupying one of the most productive agricultural areas in Europe, these brave people have continued to rebel against the crushnig domination imposed upon them by the Soviets. They have suffered indignities, tyranny, and deportation of their political leaders to Siberia. Notwithstanding these outrages, they have repeatedly asserted their desire for freedom and independence, and staged active acts of rebellion to these ends during the 1950's.

At this time, we proffer our respect and our deep compassion for the long and continuing struggle of the Ukrainian people. We hope earnestly for their eventual emergence from foreign domination. We hope that their aspirations and those of their millions of friends and descendants throughout the world may be realized, and that this captive nation may once again be numbered among the free nations of the world.

Police Capt. Roland Sagum, of Honolulu: An Outstanding Community Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, there are many different paths which man may take to help his fellow men. And in our modern society the extent to which he succeeds in his efforts to help his fellow men is often determined by his ability to choose the right profession. An example of a man who made the right choice is Capt. Roland D. Sagum of the Honolulu Police Department.

Captain Sagum, as evidenced by his innumerable civic activities, is a man of many talents. Besides his police duties, he is president of the Hawaii International Finance Corp. and a director of 16 community organizations. He has received many local and national honors for his professional and community activities.

Captain Sagum's desire to serve his fellow men started early in his career. In an interview with Charles A. Ware, of the Honolulu Advertiser, Captain Sagum revealed that one of the reasons he chose police work as a career in 1932 was to "help my people—the Filipino people." He felt that immigrants from the Philippines, who belong to one of the last ethnic groups to arrive in Hawaii, frequently got into "trouble" because of cultural and language barriers. The son of a Filipino immigrant himself, Captain Sagum felt that with his fluent command of Tagalog he would be able to help bridge the gap between this ethnic group and the community at large. Captain Sagum is truly a credit not only to the Honolulu Police Department, but to all Hawaii as well.

I am pleased to submit for reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article by Mr. Ware on Captain Roland Sagum which appeared in the Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser of January 9, 1966:

POLICE CAPTAIN SAGUM ENTERED SERVICE TO AID HIS PEOPLE

(By Charles A. Ware, assistant to the managing editor, the Advertiser)

Roland D. Sagum is the captain of police in charge of the Halawa jail.

He also is president of Hawaii International Finance Corp., and he has won a host of both local and national honors for his work as a police officer and for community service of many kinds.

Yet 40 years ago, the odds were weighted pretty heavily in favor of his winding up on the other side of the bars.

Sagum is a cheerful man, and today he can find plenty to chuckle over in the incidents of his early life in Hawaii. But he looks back with a certain sense of wonder, too, that he escaped the fate of many of his youthful companions who took an easier route to crime and prison.

"I spent my boyhood down in Aala Park," he said last week over midmorning coffee at a Keeaumoku Street restaurant. He had stopped en route from conferences at police headquarters in the Pawaa Annex to his office at the jail, in the hills above Pearl Harbor.

"We would play cards down in the park until a policeman chased us out sometime late at night," he said. "Even when I applied for my first appointment in the police department years afterward, I found I was apprehensive. I was still a little bit scared of policemen."

At one time as a boy, Sagum lived in a Honolulu home that was practically a full-time gambling headquarters.

"I think there were five rooms in the house," he said. "There would be a sakura game in one room, a dice game in another, a monte game in a third, and pangigi—a Filipino card game—in the fourth room.

"But there never was any kind of a game in the kitchen. That was because there was always 'swipes' being made under the sink.

"I tasted it a few times," Sagum confessed. "When it's first brewed, it's sweet, you know, and I thought it didn't taste bad."

Yet despite all this—or perhaps because of it—Sagum never became a drinker, he never became a gambler, and he never took up smoking.

At that time, he recalled, "I was always looking for a way to get away from that kind of life."

INFANT IMMIGRANT

Sagum was born January 1, 1912, at Batangas, in the Philippine Islands, the son of Macario and Dionicia Sagum.

He was only 8 months old when his parents came to Hawaii as sugar plantation immigrants. The family lived for some time on Maui, first at Kipahulu, then at Hana, and finally at Pauwela.

But young Roland's brothers died as children, and when he was 12 his mother died also.

A little later, his father went back to the Philippines to visit, and while there remarried. When he returned, the family came to Honolulu.

When he was 14, Sagum went to live in a men's dormitory which was operated under auspices of the Congregational Church. There, he did janitorial work for his board and room.

"That was a hard job," he said. "There were 30 rooms where I mopped the floors every day, and changed the linen, and did all of that kind of work."

But he stuck it out, and when he was 15 he entered McKinley High School.

"There werent' any junior high schools at that time," Sagum recalled, "and I entered as a freshman. Actually, our class was the last freshman class at McKinley.

"We were hazed, of course, as freshmen, and I remember thinking that next year we'd have our turn. But the next year there weren't any freshmen, and we still were the youngest class."

After his graduation from high school in 1931, Sagum entered the University of Hawaii, but after 2 years had to leave to support himself.

His first job was as a freight clerk for Castle & Cooke Terminals. It was while there that he applied for appointment to the police force.

CHANCE TO HELP

"I was a quarter of an inch too short, so my appointment was deferred for awhile," he said. "But I was fortunate. The department needed another Filipino officer badly right at that time, and in 1934 I was appointed.

"There really were two reasons that I wanted to join the police force.

"For one thing, I was thinking of my own security. That still was during the depression, you remember. And then I thought that I might be able to help my people—the Filipino people.

"There were a lot of them who did get into trouble of one kind or another, and usually they didn't have anyone to turn to.

"In those days, especially, they were faced with a lot of cultural conflict," Sagum said.

"Take all the fights, for example. They almost always started because of sensitivity—somebody felt that his pride or his honor was at stake.

"Or it might be that they just didn't understand how things are done here. If there was a theft, the man who was the victim might come into court to testify. Then, if the defendant was fined, say $25, the victim would think it was coming to him.

"When he didn't get the money, he'd feel cheated, so maybe he would go out after the defendant, to take it out on him.

"At least I knew about these things and could understand them. And I was fluent in Tagalog, so I could talk easily to the people."

Besides his decision to become a police officer, 1933 was important for another reason. In August of that year, Sagum married a McKinley schoolmate, Genevieve Anguay.

Today, they have five children: Roland Jr., who is married and who is an electronics technician for the Federal Aviation Agency; Mrs. Ginger Vea, a housewife; Marvin, a senior at the University of Hawaii, and Nelson, a sophomore, both studying engineering, and Catherine, a freshman at the university, in education.

As a rookie in the police department, Sagum was assigned first as a foot patrolman, but after only a few weeks he was detailed to the detective division.

That was at the time of a bitter sugar strike, and Sagum recalls that he spent a lot of time out at the sugar plantations "just finding out what was going on."

THE ROAD UP

At the end of the year, he was appointed officially as a detective. He remained in that division to win a series of promotions over the years that by 1947 made him a lieutenant in charge of the theft detail.

From there, he was transferred to the planning and training division, and then to the crime prevention division to work with juveniles.

He was assigned responsibility for the jail administration in 1961 when, under Honolulu's new city charter, that function was transferred from the old sheriff's office to the police department.

He has been the police department's officer in charge of security for all high ranking officials of the Republic of the Philippines when they visited here.

Through his early years in the police department, Sagum continued his education by attending night classes of the University of Hawaii.

In 1958, he was awarded a scholarship and did postgraduate study at the University of Southern California in the field of controlling juvenile delinquency.

Thinking back, Sagum can pick out several individuals and groups who influenced him profoundly and created the drive to "make something of myself" that has been a major force in his life since boyhood.

The first was a teacher at Hana, Miss Louise Mitchell, who inspired a belief in the value of education. "I know I'll never forget her," Sagum said, "even though I don't remember the names of most of the other people there."

FIVE WHO CARED

Then there was a group of five Hawaiian women at Pauwela, whose names Sagum never did know.

"I just walked into the Hawaiian church one day, and the little group of ladies there took me into a circle with them and prayed with me.

"I was leaving soon for Honolulu, and I couldn't help thinking that this was something fine for them to do. I appreciated knowing that there was someone who cared about me and wanted to see me make something of my life," he said.

A good deal later, after he had become interested in work with the Nuuanu YMCA, there were two others, who awakened his interest in business affairs.

One was Financier Chinn Ho, who then was serving as an adviser to the YMCA-affiliated Civic Associates Club which Sagum founded. The other was Hung Wai Ching, who was on the staff of the Nuuanu Y and had not yet begun his rise in the financial world.

Nevertheless, it was some years before Sagum developed any active business interests.

He became a director of Hawaii International Finance Corp. a little more than 3 years ago, and was elected to its presidency in August 1964.

Through all of his adult life, however, his overrriding interest has been in work with young people, much of it through the YMCA.

After 26 years, he still is adviser to the Civic Associates Club. He has been a member of the Nuuanu YMCA board of managers for 25 years and now is chairman of its youth committee.

All told, he is a director now of 16 community organizations and serves a dozen others in various capacities, from lay leader of Aldersgate Methodist Church, to general chairman of the Fiesta Filipina and member of the management committee of the Police Activities League.

He is a Mason and a Shriner, a member of the Waikiki Lodge No. 774, York Rite and Scottish Rite bodies, and the Aloha Temple.

As Sagum said at the beginning, it's a lucky thing for him that he sits on the right side of the bars at Halawa jail.

It's a lucky thing for Hawaii, too.

Postscript on Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on two occasions this month I have reviewed the effect on American agriculture of having operated for the first time in 14 years without a mass importation of foreign farmworkers.

The record, as I have previously indicated, is quite clear: 1965 was an excellent year for the growers, and at long last, for American farmworkers. In my own State of California, which had been the largest user of braceros, we found at the end of 1965 not that disaster had struck, but that farm income, farm wages, and farm employment all were up while prices remained generally stable.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call our colleagues' attention to two editorials—one from the Arizona Republic and the other from the Washington Evening Star—which speak further and perceptively on this subject:

[From the Arizona Republic, Jan. 11, 1966]

CHANGEOVER FROM BRACEROS PROVES NO GREAT DISASTER

(By Robert W. Glasgow)

The past year has been a frenetic, often hysterical, one for growers of produce in the Southwest. This time last year growers in California, and in Arizona, too, were at the threshold of panic as they contemplated the impending horrors that were surely to result from the termination of the bracero program. The 12 months that followed, while often confusing, were far from the disaster that too many growers pessimistically predicted. In most of the cases where growers realistically accepted the fact that the Government was no longer going to guarantee them a labor supply, where growers proceeded to accept some of the responsibilities of labor recruitment themselves—these were growers who, given good market and weather conditions, came through the ordeal very well.

The most critical area of all was California, because of a giant agricultural economy which had used some 100,000 braceros in 1964. Various economic reports are now in on California's fruit and vegetable production during 1964. The results are hardly of disaster proportion; in fact, California's farm income reached a record of $3.7 billion in 1965, although quantitatively farm production in 1965 was about 2 percent below what it was in 1964. And all this was done with a labor force that included only 3 percent who were Mexican nationals.

Strawberries and asparagus were crops where growers were not able to harvest all they had grown because of the inability to get sufficient numbers of domestic workers. Nevertheless, both strawberry and asparagus growers grossed considerably more than their preceding 5-year average. Actually, it would have been interesting to see what would have happened to the prices these growers received for their products had each grower been able to harvest all that he had grown.

And in the matter of prices the Department of Labor has released comprehensive figures from a major crop survey which show that consumer prices, while up or down in certain situations, were virtually unaffected by the abolition of braceros. One would have to admit the likelihood of a certain bias in these figures, since Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was the whipping boy throughout this situation. But even granting that there was such bias, anyone who has listened to grower complaints through the years knows that it is almost impossible to establish any cause and effect relationship between labor costs to the grower and consumer prices for particular items of produce. Growers themselves have long grumbled about the fact the prices for which produce is sold at the consumer level often seem to have no relationship to the prices which the growers received for the product.

Why this disparity is not at all clear, though many, many different kinds of reasons have been offered. One thing that is clear is that the fruit and vegetable industry is not economically a rational one. First place, this agricultural group, operating under free market conditions at one level, have not been able to establish very orderly market conditions. They have constantly been caught between the extremes of overproduction and scarcity. And in the instance where they departed from the free market philosophy, that case being the bracero program, which was a guaranteed labor supply, production conditions were worsened. An unlimited labor supply only encouraged overproduction.

Add the vagaries of weather as another factor, and it is easy to see that growing produce can be like playing Russian roulette. To survive in this industry through the years has required a pretty rugged individual. And many oldtime growers, those who have been producing since depression days, recognized that the bracero program actually encouraged inefficient producers to enter and remain in the market.

One depressing social consequence of all this was that it provided all kinds of pseudo-economic rationalizations for maintaining the cheapest labor market of any industry in the country. The elimination of the bracero program demonstrated that the growers could pay better wages, and provide better working conditions, and still make a profit, if market and weather conditions proved good. In their competition for a work force many growers this past year calmly accepted this fact and did raise wages and did improve the conditions under which migratory workers are required to live. Many other growers did not.

A study committee, headed by UCLA Law Prof. Benjamin Aaron, recently reasserted that improved housing is still a great need. The committee also recommended that there be a national minimum wage for farmworkers. Many growers do not object to the idea of a minimum wage if it is imposed nationally.

This heightening of competitive conditions has, of course, hastened the introduction of mechanization. This will not only insure higher wages, because of the higher skills involved, but it also will mean the disappearance of more and more farm jobs. Some opponents of the minimum wage for farmworkers oppose it on the grounds that it can only lead to fewer farm jobs. This is true. But the kinds of jobs that have been available to farmworkers in the past, both in terms of wages and working conditions, were not much of an alternative to unemployment and relief.

The displacement of these farmworkers by improved technology simply emphasizes the urgency of a national policy that will seek to create new fields of employment for the unskilled.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Jan. 20, 1966]

POSTSCRIPT ON BRACEROS

When Congress more than a year ago permitted Public Law 78 to expire, closing the door on Mexican bracero labor used to harvest produce, dire predictions were heard in California. Farmers spoke of leaving acreage unplanted, warning that Americans would not perform the distasteful stoop labor. Although Labor Secretary Wirtz later allowed some Mexicans to enter, this failed to calm the growers. Judging from all the talk, rotting crops and farm bankruptcies were just around the corner.

Well, the disaster never occurred. As Representative COHELAN, of California noted the other day, the State's farm income hit a record of $3.7 billion in 1965. Domestic workers received higher wages. Tens of thousands of additional jobs were made available to Americans. And because an estimated 75 percent of bracero earnings had been returning to Mexico annually, an outflow of about $50 million has been halted, aiding the balance of payments.

Even more intriguing has been the rapid development of machinery to help harvest fruit and vegetables. Tomato picking machines, for example, handled more than 20 percent of the crop and proved so successful that they are expected to gather 85 percent next year. Such devices, which use a 20-man crew, do the work of 80 fieldhands.

Development of other equipment, aided by grants from the University of California, is now being accelerated. The day does not seem far off when automatic harvesters for asparagus, cantaloupes, lettuce, and celery will be perfected. And the rapid increase in productivity that such equipment promises is bound to transform the large American farm even as industry has been revolutionized.

New problems will arise, of course, with automation in the fields. But at the same time, the trend will eliminate a good deal of drudgery, require a more highly trained employee, and pay him better. If that's wrong, then so is the whole historic direction of our mass production economy.

Statement by Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Associated Press Poverty Conference, Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson, has called this Nation to arms to do battle on two distinct fields—to battle relentlessly against Communist aggression in South Vietnam and to wage a tireless battle against the poverty, misery, and ignorance which still grips 35 million of our fellow Americans.

Abroad, the forces of communism are learning that, even though the price for freedom comes high, the American people are willing and able to keep our commitment to its protection and preservation for friends and allies thousands of miles away.

Here at home, perhaps the greatest concentrated assault on poverty ever launched in man's recorded history is underway. Across this Nation, Job Corps centers are preparing young men and women to find useful roles in our society; neighborhood youth programs are taking young Americans off street corners and putting them into centers where they learn the skills of belonging and producing for society. On August 22, 1964, President Johnson signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act establishing the war on poverty. The Vice President of the United States, Hubert H. Humphrey, has been designated by the President to act as the coordinator of the various, vast Federal programs fighting shoulder to shoulder together in the war on poverty. On November 8, 1965, the Vice President, speaking at the Associated Press Poverty Conference, held in Washington, D.C., reviewed the first year of the war on poverty. His remarks at that occasion were noteworthy then and they hold a message for all Americans today. Under unanimous consent I insert the Vice President's remarks in the Record:

Opening Statement By Vice President Hubert Humphrey at Associated Press Poverty Conference, Washington, D.C., November 8, 1965

Last December the President informed the Cabinet-level Economic Opportunity Council, at its first meeting, that he had asked me "to take a leading role in the war on poverty—to be sure that this is a well-coordinated, concentrated attack on poverty throughout the country." The President also asked me to serve as Honorary Chairman of the Advisory Council established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

In the past year, I have worked with Sargent Shriver and his effective staff in the Office of Economic Opportunity. I have traveled throughout America carrying the message that this administration intends to win the war on poverty.

I also have been doing some looking and listening regarding public reaction to the poverty program in its first year.

I think I can sum up public reaction by saying that the war on poverty has broad general support, but that there is also some misunderstanding about how it works, what it seeks to do, and how it ties into other public and private programs.

This is to be expected. Poverty has a wide range of causes and creates a wide range of problems. There is no single remedy for it.

No single program will meet all needs. There are at least three levels of actions required, and we have been moving on all three.

First, there is the need for stepped-up economic activity.

We are now in our 56th consecutive month of economic expansion—an expansion created by a positive partnership for prosperity between the public and private sectors.

GNP, wages, and profits are up. Unemployment is down. Prices are relatively stable.

We in Government have made our contribution to this expansion through careful use of fiscal and tax policy. We have pursued policies designed to avoid inflation. And we have, through economic development programs, sought to bring the benefits of economic expansion to all areas of the country.

Second, there is the need for programs for the aged, for widows and orphans, for the sick, and unemployed—for those who need society's immediate help.

In this past session of Congress we passed new and improved legislation for medical care, social security, housing, and social services.

Finally, there is the need for development of our human resources.

This is where the Economic Opportunity Act, with its nine new programs, comes in. But we must not overlook also our national investments in vocational education and manpower training, in the new education laws, the Older Americans Act, in health research—all aimed at providing opportunity for Americans to lift themselves to fuller, more productive lives.

I think it is important to understand that the war on poverty is much more than the Economic Opportunity Act. It is being waged on many fronts.

The OEO programs alone—in less than a year—have already reached into over a thousand communities, have directly involved millions of people.

In this first year there have been some mistakes. We can expect that mistakes will occur in a program this big. The question is, of course: Will we learn from our mistakes?

WE MUST DROP OR CHANGE PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT WORK

Under the direction of Dr. Joseph Kershaw, we are now giving every Federal poverty program, new as well as old, searching evaluation. If any program isn't helping to get people out of poverty, we must know. We cannot stay with it one day longer than necessary.

THE WAR ON POVERTY REQUIRES INTERAGENCY COOPERATION, AND WE HAVE BEEN GETTING IT

Last March I was widely quoted in the press after I had told a group that the poverty effort would require "interagency cooperation, the likes of which this city hasn't seen."

And I added "I hope it can be done peacefully but if it can't, it will be done."

Well, cooperation has proceeded peacefully. Federal agencies are pulling together, in the Job Corps program, in Project Head Start, and in many others. During the course of these sessions, you will see much evidence of this.

THE NEW PROGRAMS HAVE CAUSED SOME FRICTION IN OUR CITIES

One of my principal assignments is that of liaison with the Nation's mayors.

I know that the new community action programs have created some problems in the cities. Some of these have been difficult—but I am confident that they are all possible of solution.

In the great majority of cases, it has been possible to work out the kind of program that reflects both of these objectives: full utilization of the local government machinery and maximum feasible participation on the part of the poor themselves. I do not think that these are incompatible. Hundreds of communities have already proved this.

THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS NOT A CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM; BUT IT IS PART OF THE ANSWER TO THE CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEM

Three out of every four poor Americans are white. But for the American Negro, poverty is a special problem.

In his historic address at Howard University, President Johnson told us that it isn't enough to open up doors of opportunity, that it must be possible for each person to walk through those doors.

The economic opportunity program can provide the important next step for millions of Americans previously denied opportunity.

THE WAR ON POVERTY HAS MOBILIZED NOT ONLY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, BUT EVERY SEGMENT OF OUR NATIONAL LIFE

Fourteen distinguished Americans from every walk of life have been serving on our National Advisory Council.

Industry leaders serve on the OEO Business Advisory Council.

Labor leaders serve on the Labor Advisory Council.

Every religious denomination in the country has joined in the effort, participating in official programs and increasing its private efforts.

The American Legion, the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, the major women's organizations and human rights groups and civic clubs have all asked, "What can we do to help?"

For every Federal dollar and every official man-hour of effort in the war on poverty, there are several local or private dollars and man-hours. Our citizens are committed to winning this war.

A generation ago the American author Thomas Wolfe expressed the goal we work for:

"To every man his chance, to every man regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this * * * is the promise of America."

Today, the wealthiest and most powerful Nation on earth, we can make that promise come true.

What 14(b) Is All About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems facing this session of

Congress is the effort to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Too many of our citizens have been confused about this issue by the catch phrases and cliches designed by the opponents of repeal to muddy the legislative waters.

A very concise and clear explanation of what this fight is all about appeared in the January 21, 1966, edition of the Seafarer's Log, a publication of the Seafarers International Union, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

The key argument of the labor movement this year is that the Senate should have an opportunity to vote on 14(b)—up or down, right or wrong.

But let's not forget, even while we press this basic point, that we are also right on the issue.

Section 14(b) offends practically every serious student of constitutional law. It flies in the face of the Constitution that makes Federal law superior to State law. Obviously Congress would not allow the States to establish lower minimum-wage rates than the Federal standard.

Moreover, 14(b) encourages regressive competition among the States based upon low wages and freedom from union organization. This is contrary to the public interest by any measurement.

Workers themselves want the union shop. For almost 4 years the law required a secret-ballot, Labor Board vote before a union could ask for a union shop; the results were so embarrassing (97 percent of the elections won, 91 percent of the votes cast) that the sponsors of the requirement also sponsored its repeal.

People in general are also opposed to the compulsory open shop. Consider the State votes against so-called right-to-work laws in California, Colorado, Idaho, Ohio, Washington, and Oklahoma; only Kansas voted "for."

In addition, of course, in both the 1960 and 1964 campaigns the party platforms were in total disagreement on the issue, and the prorepeal party won.

The union shop is intrinsically fair. Under the Federal law, a union that has won recognition as bargaining agent has an inescapable legal obligation to give equal protection to every worker, including any who may have opposed the union. In view of this absolute legal obligation it is reasonable and correct for the union to seek a contract requiring all workers to share in the responsibility of maintaining the union—which is all that a union shop requires.

Personal liberty, or freedom from compulsion, is not a legitimate argument against the union shop. American society is replete with examples of instances where a minority is bound by the majority decision. A householder has to pay his share of taxes to support a fire department he did not want, for the fire department has to protect him along with everyone else. In many States, a lawyer can only practice if he belongs to the bar association. A union shop is one more condition of employment, established only when the employer agrees to it. If at any time a majority of the workers do not want a union shop, the law establishes a procedure through which they can abolish it.

The repeal bill makes provision for the tiny minority of workers who have genuine religious scruples against membership in secular organizations.

Repeal of section 14(b) would eliminate one aspect of destructive interstate competition—luring industry by low wages and weak unions.

In short, there is no apology we have to make or need to make on the substance of 14(b) repeal. And we have an absolute right to a vote on the issue.

WHAT ABOUT 14(b)?

Repeal of section 14(b) has been a public issue for months and it will be more so in the months to come. Your friends and neighbors, even your wife and children, will be asking you what it's all about. Here are some of the questions you can expect—along with answers that may be helpful to you.

Question. What is 14(b), anyway?

Answer: Section 14(b) is a part of the Taft-Hartley Act—the basic labor relations law. It allows the States to pass laws that forbid unions and employers from bargaining over union security, called the union shop.

Question. What's so important about the union shop?

Answer. A union shop—which requires every worker who is protected by the union contract to be a member of the union—protects the union from being undermined by the employer; assures it of enough income to do its job; and helps it to be strong enough to live up to the terms of the contract.

Question. That sounds all right for the union as an organization, but what do the workers get out of it?

Answer. First of all, the workers get better representation from a stronger, more secure union. And they have the satisfaction of knowing that everyone in the workplace is paying his fair share toward the costs of the union.

Question. Why can't unions just depend on workers to join because the union does a good job in the plant?

Answer. There are many reasons. Lots of employers, where there is no union shop, actively discourage workers from joining. In antiunion communities, as in the South, some workers who vote for the union in a secret ballot do not join because they are afraid, or because they are currying favor with the boss. In all areas, some workers don't join because they think it's smart to get something for nothing.

Question. But isn't it un-American to force a worker to join a union if he doesn't want to?

Answer. It isn't any more un-American than taxes. A homeowner may be opposed to a plan to build a new firehouse in town. But if he is outvoted, he still has to pay his share of the cost in taxes.

Question. That's all right for government; but why should a union have that kind of authority?

Answer. Because the Government has assigned a specific obligation to unions which they are legally bound to fulfill. A union that is the established bargaining agent for workers in a factory or other place of employment must provide equal protection to all workers, even those who are against the union. This obligation can be enforced through the labor board and the courts. Therefore, it is fair and reasonable for a union to seek a contract that similarly requires all workers to assume their share of the responsibility—which is all that a union shop requires.

Question. If there's a union shop, doesn't the worker lose the power to protest against union policies he doesn't like, because he can't resign from the union?

Answer. It is simply not true that they lose the power to protest. They can fight for their point of view within the union itself—something that goes on every day. They can petition for a labor board vote deauthorizing the union shop, while leaving the rest of the contract alone. They can petition for a vote to decertify their present union as bargaining agent. These remedies are not only adequate; they are far more in keeping with democratic principles than quitting in a huff.

Question. How about my neighbor, whose church tells him he can't join any other organization of any kind?

Answer. Most unions have met this problem sympathetically on a local and individual basis. Moreover, the Senate repeal bill as it now stands sets up a procedure for exempting genuine legitimate religious objectors.

Question. Isn't a lot of dues money spent on politics and other activities, besides just union affairs?

Answer. No. By far the greatest share of the dues dollar is spent on direct trade union activities—negotiations, administration, grievance procedure, organizing the unorganized, training local officers and staff, preparing necessary economic data—the bread-and-butter operations. But beyond this, the labor movement has realized for more than 30 years that it cannot live apart from the rest of the country. Education, social security, medicare, minimum wages, unemployment insurance, housing, hospitals, highways—all these and more are as important to the well-being of workers as the terms of their contract. So politics and legislation are also "union affairs." Finally, no dues money at all is contributed to political candidates in Federal elections; the law forbids it. Only voluntary COPE dollars can be used for that purpose.

Question. Just the same, won't repeal of 14(b) force millions of workers into unions they don't want, and give unions a dangerous amount of power?

Answer. Not at all. The only union shops that will go into effect automatically will be in companies where union and management had earlier agreed that they would have a union shop as soon as the law allowed it. Elsewhere in the 19 States that now have compulsory open-shop laws the issue will be the same as it is in the rest of the country—a matter of negotiation and agreement between the employer and the union. The only increase in "union power" will be, in some cases, an increase in a union's ability to protect its members—a goal which Congress has said is in the best interests of the Nation.

Question. How about those public opinion polls that show most people are in favor of keeping 14(b)?

Answer. All of these poll questions, by nature, have to be stated in simple terms. The 14(b) question, by nature, is complicated. Therefore the polls cannot reflect true opinion. It is more instructive to look at the results of seven State referendums since 1958 (labor won six), and the national elections of 1960 and 1964, when the party positions were totally opposed and the prorepeal party won.

Question. If section 14(b) is harmful and most people favor its repeal, then who actually wants it kept in the Federal law?

Answer. Support comes primarily from the selfish interests who have utilized right-to-work laws as a means of keeping unions weak, wages and social conditions poor, and as a lure to bring industry into their areas. These same persons who claim to seek "freedom" for the worker are, for the most part, the same groups and individuals who have opposed civil rights legislation, one-man, one-vote, higher minimum wages, medicare and all forward-looking legislation in the United States.

There are more questions, and more answers. The AFL-CIO hopes that these few will contribute to a public dialog on 14(b) as it is, rather than what it is said to be.

Politics, the L.B.J. Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as is simply and forthrightly stated in an editorial in the New York Times of January 15, 1966, the President maintained silence during the 12 days of the crippling transit strike in New York City, then, when the strike had finally been settled, he broke his silence by loosing a blast at New York for paying too high a price for its freedom.

Such behavior might be easier to understand if it were on the part of someone other than the President of the United States.

The President might have maintained a silence throughout the crisis in New York and continued that silence after the crisis was settled. Then it could be reasonably argued that the President did not feel an obligation to become "involved."

But the President applied one standard to the 12-day strike period—one of noninvolvement—and applied another standard to the poststrike period—one of unfounded, poorly timed criticism of a city administration which explored every avenue possible in its attempts to reach an honorable settlement of the strike.

Of course, when the steel companies announced intentions to raise prices, the President felt a compulsion to become involved. Yet, when a strike tied up the largest city in the Nation and caused the loss of many millions of dollars in wages and salaries and business, the involvement compulsion was absent.

It is certainly difficult to understand this behavior.

The New York Times editorial on this subject follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Jan. 15, 1965]

POLITICS, THE L.B.J. WAY

Through all the 12 days that New York was crippled by a transit strike called in defiance of law and court order, President Johnson had not a word of condemnation for the union leaders responsible for this exercise in economic blackmail of a city. Now that the siege has been lifted with a costly settlement, Mr. Johnson suddenly finds his voice, and censures New York for paying too high a price for its freedom.

The President is quite right in stating that the peace terms breach his anti-inflation guidelines. As we observed in these columns yesterday, none of the adroit arguments advanced in support of the pact by Dr. Nathan P. Feinsinger, chairman of Mayor Lindsay's special mediation board, could make it fit inside even an elastic interpretation of the guidelines. It was a compromise accommodation made under duress; and only the mayor's resolve not to "capitulate before the lawless demands of a single powergroup" prevented outright surrender.

If Mr. Johnson had seriously wanted to act against an inflationary settlement, he had ample opportunity to do so. On any one of the 12 days he could have denounced the strike as a threat to the national interest—which the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Gardner Ackley, now acknowledges it was—and he could have supported Mr. Lindsay in the mayor's unheeded call for arbitration, factfinding or a retroactive contract extension. But the President did not choose to do so.

Such help from Mr. Johnson would have been doubly meaningful in the light of attempts by some elements in the old-time Democratic-labor cabal in this city to exploit the strike as an instrument for humiliating the new Republican-fusion mayor, thus hoping to kill his future political career.

Now that Mr. Lindsay and the city have survived the strike, the President contributes his meed toward discrediting the settlement. The blatantly political character of his comment is underscored by the continued absence of any direct criticism of the Transport Workers Union for its coercion of the community. He declares himself "quite disturbed that essential services could be paralyzed for so long"; but there is not a hint of who is to blame. Not a word about flouting the law and the courts, not a syllable about the damage to the moral and judicial structure of this, the largest city in the United States.

The President's remarks provide a discouraging setting for the recommendations he has promised to send to Congress to protect the public interest against such strikes. Reports from Washington indicate that his state of the Union pledge of tighter strike curbs was toned down before delivery in response to objections voiced by George Meany. If even the promise must be diluted before it gets to Capitol Hill, what real hope is there in this administration for effective protection for the public against public-service strikes?

Charles O'Bevan Outstanding Labor Leader in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, last year, one of Hawaii's outstanding citizens was accorded well merited recognition for his long association with the International Typographical Union and his active and devoted service to the labor movement, from which not only the workers but also the State of Hawaii has benefited. Hawaii is indeed fortunate to have such a man as Charles K. O'Bevan, who celebrated his 50th year as a member of the ITU in 1965, and who has unstingly contributed his knowledge, experience, and daily life to promote the cause of labor and the betterment of our State.

Mr. O'Bevan has served in the public interest since his arrival in Hawaii in 1945, for 10 years as a labor commissioner and at present as chairman of the labor and industrial relations appeals board. He is also active as a member of the executive board of the Central Labor Council.

Charles O'Bevan well merits the thanks of the people in and out of organized labor for his dedication to his work and unselfish efforts. I am happy, although belatedly, to join the Central Labor Council and the Senate of Hawaii in extending hearty congratulations to Charles O'Bevan for his record of 50 years' membership in the ITU.

The esteem with which he is held by the Legislature of Hawaii and the Central Labor Council is expressed in the resolutions adopted by them, which I hereby request to have inserted in the RECORD.

SENATE RESOLUTION 147, CONGRATULATING CHARLES O'BEVAN

Whereas in 1945 Charles O'Bevan from Minnesota's clime did come to the sunny Sandwich Isles with his wife Eunice; and

Whereas he has throughout his lifetime been active in the labor movement; and

Whereas his expertise in labor was recognized by his service as a labor commissioner for 10 years, and his present service as chairman of the labor appeals board; and

Whereas for the last four sessions he has striven mightily to crank out the bills, resolutions, and committee reports of this senate in the wee hours of the morning; and

Whereas this year marks his 50th year of membership in the International Typographical Union; and

Whereas he has contributed his experience and wisdom to the betterment of our State by his service to the labor movement and to this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1965, That it does hereby congratulate Charles O'Bevan for the long and remarkable association with the International Typographical Union; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mr. and Mrs. Charles O'Bevan.

RESOLUTION CONGRATULATING BROTHER CHARLES K. O'BEVAN, BY THE CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF HAWAII, AFL–CIO, AFL–CIO LABOR TEMPLE, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Whereas Brother Charles K. O'Bevan has been a member of the International Typographical Union for 50 years; and

Whereas Charlie has been active in the labor movement throughout his lifetime; and

Whereas he has contributed many volunteer hours to the central labor council and COPE; and

Whereas he has also represented the AFL–CIO as a labor commissioner and also in his present position as chairman of the labor and industrial relations appeals board; and

Whereas Charlie has served and is presently serving as an executive board member of the central labor council: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Central Labor Council of Hawaii, AFL–CIO, at this regular meeting of May 4, 1965, That it does hereby congratulate Brother Charles K. O'Bevan for his long and remarkable association with the International Typographical Union and also his service to the Hawaii labor movement; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our thanks to Charlie's wife, Eunice, for her generosity in sharing him with us; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be distributed at the next regular meeting of the Central Labor Council of Hawaii, AFL–CIO, and transmitted to Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and to Mr. Elmer Brown, president of the International Typographical Union, AFL–CIO.

Adopted unanimously by the delegates assembled at the regular meeting of the Central Labor Council of Hawaii, AFL–CIO, on May 4, 1965.

Michigan City (Ind.) News-Dispatch Endorses 4-Year Terms for Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the REC-

ORD the text of an editorial dated January 20, 1966, from the Michigan City, Ind., News-Dispatch, published in my own congressional district, which endorses President Johnson's recent proposal for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives.

The text of the editorial follows:

Four-Year Terms for Congressmen

President Johnson's proposal for a 4-year House term struck many Members as the most admirable idea they have heard from the White House since the last congressional pay raise.

The political rose that the Chief Executive offered the House in his state of the Union message looked good to many Members who hardly finish one campaign before starting another.

Under the Constitution, all 435 House seats are up for grabs every 2 years. In the 100-seat Senate, only 33 or 34 seats normally are at stake every 2 years and terms run for 6 years.

Thoughtful political scientists and campaign-weary politicians have been suggesting for years that the system be changed. But they never have had the kind of endorsement that Mr. Johnson gave.

As a result of Mr. Johnson's totally unexpected recommendation, a constitutional amendment providing for a 4-year House term probably will get early consideration.

Mr. Johnson said: "To strengthen the work of Congress I strongly urge an amendment to provide for a 4-year term for Members of the House of Representatives—which should not begin before 1972.

"The present 2-year term requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving the Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and wisdom.

"Today, too, the work of Government is far more complex than in our early years, requiring more time to learn and master the technical tasks of legislation. And a longer term will serve to attract more men of the highest quality to political life. The Nation, the principle democracy, and each congressional district will be better served by a 4-year term. I urge your swift action."

During his speech Mr. Johnson was applauded 60 times. His reference to changing the 2-year terms to 4 years understandably drew the most vigorous applause.

It's a good suggestion and should be put into effect as soon as possible.

It's Time for the Hard Particulars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from today's headlines that some hard decisions are being made at the White House, not only for Congress but for the American people.

For those of us who sit outside that circle of leaders who have participated in the discussions at highest levels these past few days, this is proving to be a rather frustrating experience. I am sure we, all, recognize and respect the fact that the Constitution places upon the President the principal responsibility and authority for the conduct of not only our Nation's foreign policy but, in his dual capacity as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, for the conduct of our national defense, as well. By an overwhelming vote, and well aware that he would have to be dealing with the crucial problems already then troubling us in Vietnam, the American people by an overwhelming vote in the last presidential election entrusted President Johnson with these awesome responsibilities.

I am sure that trust still prevails, even today when the need to choose the proper course to follow now in that complex and dangerous conflict has assumed proportions unthought of a scant 15 months ago.

Still, Mr. Speaker, this Congress—this House of Representatives—has a clear and constitutional responsibility, proportionately borne by each one of us alike in behalf of those individual citizens we represent, to assure itself that the decisions now so evidently being made are the right ones, both for America and for the cause of world peace with freedom.

It is because of my own individual awareness of my share in this responsibility that, on several occasions during the first session of this Congress, I urged that full hearings be held by the appropriate committees in this and the other body of Congress, for the purpose of going into and reviewing in depth and detail not only our more immediate problems in Vietnam but our whole policy, whatever it might be, in southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge that this be done.

In doing so, I am fully aware of the present burdens—and the time problems—placed upon not only the President but on the Secretaries of State and Defense, as well as on our military people who are in charge of the day-to-day military operations in Vietnam. I do not wish to add to those burdens.

But I also wish to be assured that all the various options—or alternatives—available to us, if indeed there be any, have been fully and freely considered. At present, I have no way I know of for gaining that assurance, and I know full well that time, right now, does not permit us here in Congress to utilize the cumbersome committee system for such purposes.

Still, those of us who must needs sit here and wait, for now, can present some of those possible alternatives, or at least some contrasting viewpoints about the military aspects of Vietnam, for each other's consideration. In line, then, with that, I now include—under leave granted January 18 to extend my remarks and include extraneous material—the following column by Vermont Royster, as taken from the January 25 issue of the Wall Street Journal, commenting on the recent article written for Harper's magazine by Gen. James Gavin in which he presents some critical military questions concerning the war in Vietnam which questions, surely, should have our consideration:

The General's Particulars

(By Vermont Royster)

Gen. James Gavin's comments on the war in Vietnam, appearing in the current issue of Harper's, seem to have attracted a good bit of public attention. Well they might, and well they ought.

For General Gavin is the first militarily knowledgeable person to discuss publicly the cold, hard military practicalities of that war, shunning sentiment, broad abstractions, or philosophic generalities.

Proceeding thusly, General Gavin comes to some conclusions about our military posture in Vietnam that are controversial, and must be very disturbing to those who will hear the general out.

In brief, he says that the military objective of freeing the entire country of South Vietnam from the Vietcong is stretching our military resources beyond all reason. To increase or extend the bombing of North Vietnam, or otherwise escalate the war, will, in his opinion, add to our problems rather than detract from them.

He proposes that we accept a much more limited objective which he thinks is feasible and practical. This is to deploy our forces not over the whole country but to hold several enclaves on the coast where our sea and air power can be fully effective. Presumably these would include Saigon for political reasons. As bases for military operations he mentions Danang and Camranh Bay, places where we are already established.

This obviously offers no satisfaction to either those hawks eager to clobber the Vietcong even if it means taking on China, or to those doves who in the name of peace would have us come home and hand over the whole place to Communist Hanoi. Here is a general saying we must accept a substitute for victory.

This view of the war, however controversial, deserves everyone's thoughtful reflection, both because of the reasoned manner in which he arrives at it and because of the credentials of its author.

General Gavin is no newcomer to this vexing problem. Although perhaps better known reecntly as Ambassador to France, he has had a long and distinguished record as a soldier from private to general. In World War II he was a daring paratroop leader, but more to the present point he was Chief of Plans and Operations for the Army at the time of the French defeat and ouster from Vietnam.

At that time General Gavin was intimately involved in the decision whether to send U.S. forces into the Hanoi delta. The further that agonizing appraisal proceeded the more apparent it became that we would really be fighting not Hanoi but China, which would be providing the arms, ammunition and other supplies even if no troops.

That being the case, the military planners concluded that by any deep engagement in a land war in Vietnam we would be fighting China "in the wrong place on terms entirely to her advantage." This conclusion was presented to President Eisenhower, who concurred, and it was on the basis of this hard military analysis that the United States then decided not to intervene.

General Gavin is of the opinion that there is no reason now to alter that basic analysis. His military judgment is that today we are not only fighting the wrong war on the wrong terms but that we are exposing ourselves to grave military perils.

His reasoning is quite straightforward. The large forces we have committed there stretch thin every resource and leave our flanks exposed. If we enlarge them we can expect a reopening of the Korean front or an attack elsewhere, or both. "This seems to be," he writes, "the ultimate prospect of the course that we are now on."

He does not accept the so-called domino theory that a check on one battlefield would topple everything. "Economics, science and technology * * * will in the long run serve our strategic interests well if we handle our national resources wisely. On the other hand, tactical mistakes that are allowed to escalate at the initiative of an enemy could be disastrously costly."

A civilian will not find it easy to assess the correctness of this military judgment. Nonetheless, General Gavin has raised the right questions and joined the issue where it ought to be joined—namely, whether or not the present military policy in Vietnam makes military sense.

The country must, as General Gavin does, try to look at that war without myopia. The tactical problem mustn't be fuzzed up with sentiment or fears about injuries to pride or prestige; a general would be a fool who let pride keep him from withdrawing his troops to a ridge that would give himself, not the enemy, the advantages of the field. And we must be willing to see this particular battlefield in the context of an enduring strategic struggle over Asia.

In that long-range struggle the first objective is safeguarding the military strength of this country, the United States. That way, and only that way, can the United States serve as a shield of the civilized world.

It follows, then, that what weakens us weakens the shield, that any tactical mistakes "disastrously costly" to ourselves will be equally so to all who depend upon us for succor. It also follows, in General Gavin's phrase, that "we should be realistic about the course we are now on."

Being realistic does not mean being defeatist. It does not mean agreeing with General Gavin. It does not mean a reversal of the policy of resisting aggression in Vietnam. All it means is an honest effort to avoid military misjudgments fathered by pride.

Perhaps the present military leaders have a different military assessment of our tactical position in Vietnam. They may have military reasons to believe that the risk is not so grave, or that victory on this particular battlefield can be more easily achieved. In short, General Gavin may be wrong.

But if so, should we not hear the cold, realistic assessment of those presently entrusted with the military judgment? It is hardly enough just to say we "must" win because we are "pledged" or because we have a "moral duty." All can be lost in Pyrrhic victories.

With so much at stake it's time the debate moved from the easy generalities to the hard particulars.

The Appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 18, 1966

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress created the Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development to deal with the urgent problems facing our great cities.

President Johnson searched long and hard to find the man best qualified to fill this post because he, too, recognized that our great cities are in crisis. Through his appointment of Dr. Robert C. Weaver, this new Department will reap the advantages of continuity, experience, and a broad view of the problems.

In an editorial praising President Johnson's appointment, the Milwaukee Journal called Dr. Weaver and his first assistant, Prof. Robert Wood, "a promising team to manage the very complex and terribly responsible job of fulfilling HUD's destiny to be a key Department in the Cabinet of a predominately urban Nation."

The full editorial, from the January 14, 1966, Milwaukee Journal, follows:

The Weaver Appointment

President Johnson has named the first Negro in history to the U.S. Cabinet. The choice of Robert Weaver had been publicly discussed and anticipated for several years. President Kennedy had said he would name him as soon as the Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was created, but the opportunity fell to Johnson instead.

The fact that Weaver is a Negro cannot help but stand out in this country and in the world. It is a milestone in the history of his race and a splendid personal achievement by himself.

It is vital to observe, however, that he is not being elevated to this unprecedented eminence because he is of the minority race. He has worked for it and earned it on his own, as a skilled and experienced public official for more than 30 years. With a Harvard Ph. D. in economics, he became a public housing administrator in the New Deal, has both administered and taught in the fields of housing and urban renewal ever since—most recently, of course, as head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which has become the new HUD.

As a onetime head of the National Association for the Advancement Colored People, his credentials as a civil rightist are complete. The thing about this is that he has also proved his complete integrity as an administrator on behalf of people: he has been just as "color blind" as any white official would have been expected to be, and this is publicly recognized even in southern quarters of the Senate that must confirm him.

The President did put his individual stamp on the manning of HUD by imaginatively choosing Prof. Robert Wood of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to be Weaver's right-hand man. The brilliant young Young may well be the Nation's top academic expert in the field of urban affairs.

It looks like a promising team to manage the very complex and terribly responsible job of fulfilling HUD's destiny to be a key department in the Cabinet of a predominantly urban nation.

The President's Annual Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, with his usual incisive style, W. R. Mathews, long-time editor and publisher of the Arizona Daily Star of Tucson, has analyzed the President's state of the Union message. Mr. Mathews presents thoughts which I feel should be brought to the attention of all Members.

The article follows:

[From the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Star, Jan. 14, 1966]

The President's Annual Message

The state of the Union message, such as that delivered by President Johnson before Congress Wednesday, has become by custom an annual event in the life of our country. Although Presidents have done this since the beginning of our country, it was President Woodrow Wilson who started the custom of appearing before Congress in person to deliver it.

Actually, according to the Constitution, every message that the President addresses publicly to Congress is a state of the Union message. The Constitution, article II, section 3, reads as follows: "He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommended to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

President Johnson's Wednesday night message was literally a state of the Union one. He covered the waterfront without missing anything, and made plain that the status of domestic affairs shall come ahead of everything else. Nearly every organized minority will get what it seeks, while every social welfare project initiated by him and passed by Congress will be continued without any reduction in appropriations.

He has become the first President to call for the adoption of a constitutional amendment authorizing a 4-year term for Members of the House in place of the present 2-year term. This is a wise and badly needed reform. The shocking increase in the cost of political campaigning every 2 years alone justifies the change. If Congress itself will pass the legislation, it probably will get a quick ratification by the State legislatures.

His suggestion that our foreign trade be liberalized so that there can be increased trade between our country and the countries of Eastern Europe, is also a wise suggestion, although it is an unpopular idea in some sectors of American life.

He asks for "new measuers to enable us effectively to deal with strikes, which threaten irreparable damage to the public interest." He offsets that unpleasant note to labor bosses by again urging repeal of that controversial section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley law, which would nullify right-to-work laws in 19 States, of which Arizona is one.

Although the war in Vietnam has become one of the most bewildering and pressing issues before the American people, he adds not one thing new to what he has said in the past, and by his silence on the bombing of North Vietnam indicates that his present policy of no bombing there shall continue. As usual, he pleads for peace, just as nearly every American does; but most Americans know from history that when they get involved in a war, their armies have to do more than just stand guard and give sanctuary from bombing to the country of the enemy we are fighting.

Continuation of this soft, indecisive policy in the name of peace defies the experiences of history. When in history has such a restrained military policy brought peace? It has been mistaken as a sign of weakness, which our enemy sees confirmed by the various pacifist demonstrations in our country.

North Vietnam will have no reason to answer the President's constant overtures about negotiation and peace, until it is hurt and hurt badly. The industrial complex of North Vietnam must be destroyed. Life in the cities of North Vietnam must be paralyzed by bombing. This must be done until the Communist leaders of North Vietnam plead for peace.

Wars cannot be fought with feather dusters, as, figuratively, we are doing now. We have to use our battleaxes. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force must unleash their power and make war. Not until we do, will there be the slightest chance of peace.

We must not be tricked by agreeing to restrict our warmaking abilities by any offer of negotiations. Certainly if any offer is made for negotiations, we should accept, but we must not agree to a ceasefire. We will weaken our whole position of negotiation, unless we continue to make war with all of our power while negotiations go on.

President Johnson's present policy of constantly talking about how willing he is to negotiate and make peace is wrong. Instead of promoting peace it is prolonging the war, not shortening it. His reluctance to use his military forces offensively make him appear to the Vietcong and Peiping as an irresolute weakling whom they eventually can defeat, and thereby win their major objectives. He can change this image the enemy has of him and our country only by waging war offensively and, in particular, hurting North Vietnam so badly that it pleads for peace instead of defying it.

H.R. 8282 Discriminatory and Damaging to Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill, House bill 8282, which I believe could have a damaging effect on the 43 private colleges in the State of Illinois.

House bill 8283 threatens to upset the teamwork of tax-supported and private institutions of higher education by making unemployment insurance payments by not-for-profit private colleges and universities compulsory. The bill would lump the private colleges and universities with other nonprofit institutions that have a higher employee turnover and a higher need for such employee protection. Under the bill, tax-supported institutions are exempted from the new tax.

I agree with the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities which has described House bill 8282 as now written as "discriminatory and damaging" to higher education. Also, other nonprofit institutions like the YMCA and Goodwill Industries would be irreparably hurt by the imposition of this new tax.

In opposition to House bill 8282 are the following Illinois colleges and universities: Augustana College, Aurora College, Barat College, Blackburn College, Bradley University, College of St. Francis, Concordia Teachers College, DeLourdes College, DePaul University, Elmhurst College, Eureka College, George Williams College, Greenville College, Illinois College, Illinois Institute of Technology, Illinois Wesleyan University, Kendall College, Knox College, Lake Forest College, Lincoln College, Loyola University, MacMurray College, McKendree College, Millikin University, Monmouth College, Monticello College, Mundelein College, National College of Education, North Central College, North Park College, Northwestern University, Olivet Nazarene College, Pestalozzi Froebel Teachers College, Principia College, Quincy College, Rockford College, Roosevelt University, Rosary College, St. Xavier College, St. Procopius College, Shimer College, the University of Chicago, and Wheaton College.

It is my hope that the Members of the House will seriously consider the impact of House bill 8282, keeping in mind its detrimental effect on not-for-profit institutions.

I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the following editorials from the December 8, 1965, edition of the Chicago Sun-Times and from the December 13, 1965, edition of the Chicago Daily News:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Dec. 13, 1965]

UNFAIR TO PRIVATE COLLEGES

When Congress reconvenes in January it will consider legislation that threatens to upset the balanced teamwork of tax-supported and private, not-for-profit institutions of higher education. Neither would benefit.

House bill 8282 would make unemployment insurance payments by non-profit colleges and universities compulsory, lumping them with other nonprofit institutions that have a higher employee turnover and a higher need for such employee protection. Tax-supported institutions are exempted.

This measure would throw an additional burden on the strained finances of the private schools and impair their ability to get on with their basic task, education. This in turn could only mean a greater burden on the taxpayer since more students would turn to State-supported schools.

Private schools must be kept strong. By virtue of their political independence they are indispensable in the American education system. The private school, moreover, despite the vast growth of tax-supported education, continues to carry a significant share of the student load. In Illinois alone, 42.8 percent of the 312,180 students in colleges and universities attend private institutions, and a greater percentage of these students are degree candidates than those in State schools.

The desire to extend unemployment insurance to the employees of not-for-profit institutions is an understandable one. But to do so by a bill that doesn't take into account the differing work experience and responsibilities of these institutions is unwise. We agree with the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities which, in a recent statement, described H.R. 8282 as now written as "discriminatory and damaging" to higher education.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Dec. 8, 1965]

UNNEEDED JOB INSURANCE

The Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities has called our attention to a bill now before Congress that would seriously impair the operations of not alone private colleges and universities but other nonprofit institutions.

This is House bill 8282, which would impose compulsory unemployment insurance upon nonprofit institutions. One curious aspect of the bill is that it does not impose the same tax upon tax-supported schools. This omission, as the federation points out, "would place the privately supported colleges and universities at an unwarranted disadvantage in their efforts to provide higher education for a large percentage of the students attending Illinois institutions."

The private colleges are too important to Illinois, and to the Nation, for them to be burdened with this disadvantage and expense. Preliminary estimates indicate that private institutions have enrolled 42.8 percent of the 312,180 students attending colleges and universities in Illinois, and the percentage is even higher if you deduct the numbers in tax-supported junior colleges who are not studying for academic degrees. It takes no slide rule to demonstrate that an insufferable tax burden would be created if all the students were enrolled in State schools.

Furthermore, the employees of the colleges do not need the protection of unemployment insurance, which is designed to protect workers during periods of depression or in seasonal or erratic industries. Colleges and universities offer steady, permanent employment that is not radically affected by season or business cycles. And other nonprofit institutions, such as the YMCA and the Goodwill Industries, which employ workers under very special circumstances, would be irreparably disrupted by the imposition of the tax.

The plan, in a word, seems to be a thoroughly unfortunate one that Congress should kill once and for all. It would create many problems and solve none.

A Good Way To Lose Contact With Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 20, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a question which will command much interest during the present session of Congress will be the question of extending the terms of Members of the House of Representatives to 4 years.

Our whole system of government presupposes responsibility of House Members to reflect the majority will of their constituents when that can be determined. In this regard, I feel it is essential to our system of government "of, by, and for the people" that those who elect Representatives be able to review the work and record of their legislators, and make changes if they see fit, at as frequent intervals as practical.

As I see it a 2-year term is a desirable protection of the people against tyranny and rubberstamp government. Otherwise the House of Representatives will lose much of its accountability to the people it is supposed to represent.

Mr. Speaker, the Bremerton Sun, Bremerton, Wash., discussed this question quite well in an editorial on January 18, and believing the views expressed therein will be of interest to my colleagues and all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I ask that the text of this editorial be printed hereafter.

The editorial follows:

FOUR-YEAR TERMS FOR CONGRESS IS A GOOD WAY TO LOSE CONTACT

Among the other suggestions made by the President in his state of the Union address was one that would extend the terms of Representatives in Congress to 4 years.

This is not a new suggestion; Congress tries something like it every year. The argument is that Congressmen who have to spend most of every other year campaigning back home can't keep their minds on legislative matters. The not so insignificant matter of expense of campaigning is also raised as an issue.

We hope that such a suggestion fails again.

It has been our belief that the Congress is made up of two parts for a very good reason; the Senate, whose Members are elected for 6 years and whose function is more on the policy level, and the House of Representatives, whose Members serve for 2 years and who are truly the "voice of the people" in the legislative branch.

To maintain close contact with the folks back home, it is necessary for Representatives to return at least every other year and put their records on the line for the voters. They must, by circumstance, explain, defend where necessary, and try to convince the voters that their performance has been in the best interest of those whom they represent.

We think this is a good arrangement.

U.S. Senators sometimes don't get home very often. They naturally, feel that they are secure for at least 6 years and don't have to do so much explaining—until the last couple of years of their terms. Then they're home quite a lot.

It is in the best interests of the original intent of the framers of the legislative branch of government that Members of the House of Representatives stay close to their constituents. Having to come back every other year and work for reelection is one of the best ways, we believe, for that intimacy to be maintained.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. On that day Americans of Ukrainian descent celebrated the cause of Ukrainian freedom. It is a cause to which I am personally deeply committed. On January 22, 1918, Ukrainian patriots took advantage of the Russian revolution and proclaimed their national independence. But within less than 3 years the national hopes and aspirations of the Ukrainian people had been brutally crushed by the numerically superior Red army.

Today I should like to discuss the period of history in which the Ukraine's independence was declared, for it constitutes a stirring chapter in the story of the Ukrainian people. In November of 1917 the Bolsheviks overthrew the provisional Russian Government under Alexander Kerensky in Moscow. But in the Ukraine, the beginnings of a democratic republic were evident. On November 20 the Ukrainian Rada or Parliament issued its third universal, which showed how far Ukrainian thought had gone. Although the Rada did not yet advocate a complete break with Russia, it provided for the establishment of a democratic republic and guaranteed to all citizens those democratic rights that form the basis of a free country.

Although Lenin nominally accepted Ukrainian independence in December he also presented the Rada with an unacceptable ultimatum. The Ukrainians bravely defied the ultimatum, although they knew that their defiance might result in an invasion from Moscow. Even as Soviet troops were approaching Kiev the brave Ukrainians declared their independence on January 22, in the form of a Fourth Universal issued by the Rada. The Soviets entered Kiev only a few weeks later and instituted an unprecedented and brutal reign of terror.

But the Ukrainians fought on, for almost 3 more years. The withdrawal of the Ukrainian National Republic forces in November of 1920 marked the close of a chapter in the heroic struggle for national independence. But it was not the end of a book. For the Ukrainian people remember the heroes of their past and are determined that someday they shall be vindicated.

I should like once again to affirm my complete dedication to the cause of liberty and national self-determination for the Ukrainian people.

Coach Dan Jessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, not long ago in Washington the American Football Coaches Association selected a man of whom we in Connecticut and New England are justly proud to be its president.

Dan Jessee has had good teams at Trinity College in Hartford for longer than many of us care to remember. I was privileged to play against some of them, although I recall that at the time the energy and effort they showed did not always make it feel a privilege. Trinity was the arch rival of the university I attended, and we knew each year that they would be a formidable opponent.

I was proud to be invited to attend a gathering of Connecticut coaches arranged here in Washington concurrently with the meeting at which he assumed his new office. We were pleased at the chance to salute his accomplishments, and I request that a news story of his fine career be placed in the Record so that the House may be familiar with his story.

The article follows:

[From the Hartford Courant, Jan. 9, 1966]

Dan Jessee: Profile of a Coach

Note.—Veteran Trinity College Coach Dan Jessee will become president of the American College Football Coaches Association this week. The following article on his illustrious career at Trinity was written by Mr. Louis deRonge, a fellow townsman from West Hartford, a graduate of Trinity in the class of 1914 and a longtime admirer of the teaching talents of Mr. Jessee.

(By Louis deRonge)

One of the country's ablest offensive football coaches, in the opinion of Lou Little of Columbia and others, is Daniel E. Jessee, who holds the longest unbroken tenure as head football coach at one college. He came from the west coast to Hartford in 1932 and will be starting his 34th year with Trinity College's Bantams in September.

He has established records any coach might envy.

Trinity's first undefeated, untied team came in Jessee's third year—1934. Other undefeated, untied teams were 1949, 1954, and 1955. The Connecticut Sportswriters Alliance named him coach of the year after the 1949 season.

Jessee's success on the offensive is due to great creative ability. This is not only a natural talent but is partly due to his preoccupation with, and love for, the game. A graduate has said that Dan's red corpuscles are shaped like footballs and baseballs—about evenly divided. In baseball season, his concentration is also intense; but probably because beyond a certain point a coach cannot be as creative in baseball, his skill as a tactician and master of improvisation has revealed itself especially on the gridiron. An opponent once said of his own coach: "We know what he's going to do; we never know about Jessee."

During the first game of the season a few years ago, someone told Dan that he was worried because scouts from next week's opponents were taking notes on Trinity's plays. Dan's reply was to the effect that the scouts couldn't learn much because he himself didn't know what plays he'd use next week.

TWO STARS HONORED

No other active coach has seen two of his star players, from one college, commemorated by Sports Illustrated on the 25th anniversaries of their graduations. Charles T. Kingston, Trinity 1934, who played every minute of every game when he captained the 1933 team, is a successful insurance man in Hartford. He was the first president of the All-America Foundation. Robert O'Malley, 1937, a well-known Holyoke, Mass., doctor, is still discussed in awed tones by those who witnessed his performances as both passer and receiver.

Jessee naturally likes to talk about the men who were stars, but he has respect and liking for the less gifted who always do their best. Often these boys who can't make the team are the most valuable men on the squad because of their fine example of pluck and persistence. To such men Dan is someone to whom they turn for advice either while in college or later. Many of his former students are proud to call him friend. For men who loaf on the job, Dan has little use and no sympathy.

In both baseball and football he is recognized as a great teacher. Men who have played on his teams stress this point—particularly those who have acted, or are acting, as professional or volunteer coaches of school and college teams. The first book published on baseball was written by Jessee. Entitled simply "Baseball," it is well written and well illustrated. It is still used as a textbook by many institutions.

DAN'S A PERFECTIONIST

In appearance the "Old Professor" as one admiring sports writer calls him (he's a full professor of physical education) is clean cut and slightly stern. He isn't large but looks sturdy and physically fit. It's unlikely that you'd guess that his graduation from Pacific University, Oregon, was as long ago as 1926. On the field he seldom shouts, and though he can use picturesque language, he is never blasphemous. He uses few words in praise of an assignment well performed. He is satisfied with nothing less than a man's utmost.

Being a perfectionist, he drills his teams in fundamentals—repeating, repeating and repeating the small points which, after a while, make the player an expert within the limits of his capability. Of Trinity's baseball teams it has been said "even when they're beaten they look good." They do things the way Jessee expects a "pro" to do them. Dan started on a professional baseball career with the Cleveland Indians but an injury stopped him.

He treats his players like men. He believes that the greater the knowledge of basic things and the more habitual the use of that knowledge, the more enjoyment the players will have. To one of his football stars who was trying to explain why he hadn't carried out an assignment very well, he said coolly: "Do you want me to pat you on the back?"

Bill Scully, one of Trinity's greatest pitchers, had been a student of the game from boyhood but found "I didn't know anything when Dan started coaching me." Once, in a game. Scully was irritated by one of the coach's suggestions, and growled: "Will you shut up and let me pitch?" Out of the game he came. Dan acts quickly, is a disciplinarian and is lavish with neither praise nor forgiveness.

WENT FOR RACQUETS, TOO

Until he went to Trinity, Dan had not played squash racquets, but he learned to like the game and became so good at it that he was induced to coach the college team. He did this for 20 years, winning about 60 percent of the games. Now, with baseball, football, and a full schedule of physical education classes, he has turned this fine minor sport over to another man.

Jessee has a sense of humor, and a good one, "but," says one of his old stars, "not from September through the middle of November." He enjoys his work but is serious about it. He wants his players to have fun but not of the frivolous variety. However, he can be broken up as well as the next man by the ridiculous. Don Viering, Trinity 432, prominent Hartford businessman, recalls that Jessee, between halves of a game in 341, got the team so fired up that they dashed out of the fieldhouse determined to overcome a 13-point deficit. Tension was acute. Viering, jaw set, charged toward the door like a battering ram and stepped in a wastebasket, wedging his foot so firmly in it that he had to get a teammate to help him—the way a cavalry officer needed aid, occasionally, with tight boots in the days when there was cavalry. Tension dissolved, but not the will to win. Trinity's victory was 14 to 13.

Stressing Dan's ability as a teacher, Viering—who coaches winning Little League baseball teams, credits him with his success. "Start the kids right; otherwise they'll later have to unlearn and start over." For instance, it is instinctive for a green infielder seeing a grounder smashed at him, to kneel so that one leg, at right angles to the path of the ball, will act as a barrier. Jessee won't allow it. Charge the grounder, scoop the ball with an away-from-you motion and you're set to throw, he says.

PLAYER'S TESTIFY

Other alumni interviewed who are or have been coaches, were Joe Beidler, 1942; Felix Karsky, 1955; Ted Knurek, 1941; Bob Barrows, 1950; and Charlie Sticka, 1956. Robert Morris, 1916, a fine end in "the old days," and author of "Pigskin Parade at Trinity," was also consulted. Members of a recent team sang the same song as their predecessors. A former baseball captain called Dan "a wonderful person. There's no pretense. You always know where you stand with him." Another graduate says: "How right he is in everything he preaches."

Jesse will back up his men in a dispute if they're right. He tells them never to object to an umpire's ruling unless they're positive the call was wrong. Knowing all the rules as well as he knows the shape of a ball, Dan won't hesitate to call down an erring official.

Kingston thinks that one of the greatest changes in football philosophy brought about by Jessee's arrival at Trinity was abandonment of the "we didn't win but we played a good game" type of thinking. Dan is fiercely competitive and wants to win—not because losing would endanger his job, which it wouldn't—but just because he doesn't like to lose. Men who know him well say that he has mellowed, but he still has that strong urge to win. This feeling is imparted to his players. He expects his teams to play hard, bruising ball, but never dirty. During the week he reasons with the players rather than lectures down to them. If every man knows a play in detail, the individual will know his own part in detail. Years ago a somewhat confused lineman asked: "Which way do I push who?" Jessee left it to the English department to straighten out this man's grammar. He makes sure that before a game all the men know just what victims are to be pushed and where. His knowledge of player psychology is so thorough that his instructions will sometimes run counter to a student's instinct. A recent player was told what move to make in order to induce his opposite to move away from the upcoming Trinity play. To the player the advice seemed exactly wrong, but he did as he was told, and "by golly, Dan was right. He's practically always right."

If Jessee can develop a good quarterback (and he has molded some top-notchers) a man whose thinking about strategy is similar to his—there's little coaching given or needed during a game. Charles Sticka, captain in 1955, Little All-American praises Dan as an individual and as a coach who expects 100 percent effort. He quotes his advice: "Never give a sucker a break or he'll kill you."

Noting that Dan generally has 26 to 28 men on his squad, he thinks the decision to avoid contact work during the week is sound. Injuries can happen in practice scrimmage as well as in a game, and Jessee wants to start a game with all his men in good condition.

One of Trinity's finest halfbacks, William Goralski, 1952, captain of the 1951 team, sustained the severest injury ever suffered by a Trinity player—the same sort of paralysis suffered by pole-vaulter Sternberg. "Bill," characterized by Jessee as a wonderful fellow and a great team player, has overcome his disability to a large extent. He is a teacher at Simsbury High School. He is a member of Trinity's athletic advisory council, so he and Dan see each other often and are firm friends. Goralski's recovery, Dan says, is largely due to hard work and determination.

No man is an angel, we told ourself, so maybe Dan—a cigar smoker—drops ashes on the rug or hangs his clothes on the floor or is guilty of some other annoying petty crime. Mrs. Jessee, a charming woman, dashed this base hope to darken his character. Her home in West Hartford could be an advertisement for soap, polish, and vacuum cleaners. It's easy to keep that way because Dan likes a clean house as much as she does. She shares the opinion of his athletes: "He's a perfectionist. He enjoys his home and spends most of his spare time here. Sometimes he'll just sit for long periods, thinking. Then suddenly he'll whip a pencil out of his pocket and write something." When this occurs, she knows that he has dreamed up a new play for the Trinity 11. While we were talking about him he was outside giving another demonstration of his desire to have things right; he was washing his car which always looks well scrubbed.

The Jessees have one child, a married daughter who lives in Pennsylvania, and one grandson, a handsome little boy whose photograph is prominently displayed in their living room. Mrs. Jessee was Charlotte Allen, of Forest Grove, Oreg., before they were married in 1928. Men who have played for Trinity during the Jessee era often go to see the Jessees. Both Dan and Mrs. Jessee treasure these associations. Sometimes during the college year when there's a prom and one of Dan's students is inviting an out-of-town girl, he knows that the Jessees will gladly have her as their guest.

There's another record Jessee may hold—the coach who has done the most traveling. During World War II and subsequently he conducted coaching clinics for the Armed Forces in Europe, South America, the Far East, and Greenland. He has flown over 100,000 miles on these missions. That isn't all. He and Mrs. Jessee both enjoy driving, and since they moved to Connecticut they've made 29 round trips across the United States. In 1962 on his sabbatical leave, he visited about 35 colleges and conversed with most of their coaches. He found that nearly all of them wanted the return of the two-platoon system, as he did. Naturally he is pleased with the new rules. He thinks there isn't enough practice time for college students to learn both offense and defense adequately. With two units—one offensive, one defensive—each can be thoroughly trained and more boys will be able to play. Better football will result.

Dan has sometimes been adversely criticized for not doing enough substituting. Many a man has sat, game after game, hoping that he'd replace some weary player, but at the final whistle he'd still be on the bench. Nothing would please Jessee more than to give all the men on his squad chances in every game, but in recent years the rules on substitution have made this almost impossible for the coach with a small squad. This difficulty has not been generally understood and in fact has probably been encountered only by the so-called Little Ivy League colleges where there are no athletic scholarships. Furthermore, there's no real recruiting at Trinity. Dan takes what comes and what he does with some of his material is remarkable. It isn't much of a trick if you can hire whatever players you need to plug weak spots; and in effect hiring is what happens in many large institutions. If Jessee could indulge in such financing he'd be able to take on almost any college in the country.

Dan uses substitutes in case of injury or if Trinity's margin of victory is so large that he can safely use men of lesser ability. He plays no favorites. He selects the best men from his small squad and trusts those 11 to win. Why use any but the best? He is sure that he is fair. "I don't try to please any particular individual."

He believes in football as a character builder. The game is rugged; so is life. From his players he expects promptness and self-discipline. Teamwork develops a feeling of group loyalty. Dan thinks that in colleges where panty raids and other outbursts of excess energy occur, it is unlikely that many athletes participate. He was a star athlete himself—a nine-letter man—and he thinks the demands of the athlete minimize the appeal of such nonsense.

When he decided to make coaching and physical education his life work, he entered Columbia University where the head of the physical education department rated him as one of the finest football students in Columbia's history. To Trinity he brought a modified single wingback system but he has been quick to develop new methods of offense.

Among the outstanding Trinity men who have gone on to play professionally are Roger LeClerc, 1960, great field goal kicker with the Chicago Bears; Bill deColigny, 1960, with the Canadian Football League; "Moe" Drabowski, 1957, one of baseball's bonus babies; Bob Alexander, 1955, quarterback drafted by the Bears, and Sticka, 1956, who was prevented from playing professional football by a baseball injury. In the fall of 1955, Sticka set a Trinity rushing record for one season—900 yards. Other greats were Dr. Milton Kobrosky, 1937, Little All-American halfback, and Lambert "Whitey" Oberg, 1951, All-New England and All-East on the unbeaten 1949 team.

Jessee is a trustee of the National Football Coaches Association. He served for several years as a member of the National Football Association Rules Committee and in 1961 was on the Lambert Trophies Selection Committee. Last year he was made a member of the Football Hall of Fame.

Dan is considered to be an Oregonian, but he was born in Kentucky. His family moved west when he was 3 years old. Although he does indulge in protracted periods of just thinking, he can talk interestingly and is in demand as a speaker for men's groups such as Rotary, Kiwanis, and men's clubs of insurance companies. His memory is remarkable. He can talk at length about sports, athletes, and the many parts of the world he has visited or read about. Geography is a hobby and the National Geographic one of his favorite publications. Always, though, in the background—and not very far back—are baseball and football, and they'll come to the fore at less than the drop of a helmet.

Toward Better United States-Canadian Relations: A Real Pacemaker

SPEECH

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 24, 1966

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for a great length of time the United States has worked together in peace and harmony with our neighbor to the north, Canada. In business, in government, and in other fields of endeavor, the two peoples have enjoyed a warm and friendly relationship.

In commerce and industry, the development of close ties has been a key element in our mutual economic progress.

In Canada, numerous American firms have established subsidiary companies. Trade relations between our two countries must continue to reflect the interests of both the United States and Canada. The unhindered growth of two-way business relations between Canada and the United States is a laudable achievement in a troubled world. My interest here led me to survey the records of some respected international private firms.

Typical of the good-neighbor business policy is the relationship of a dynamic young Canadian concern, whose success vividly illustrates my point. Clairtone Sound Corp., Ltd., which sells electronic entertainment equipment such as high-fidelity systems, has established a solid working relationship with American business and, in so doing, clearly shows the way in accomplishing mutually beneficial commercial ties.

Demonstrating the firm's export-oriented complexion, the Clairtone Sound Corp., has erected a nationwide sales organization in the United States, with permanent offices in such major cities as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. One of Canada's most respected companies, it also maintains branches abroad in France, Great Britain, and Germany. The company is an enthusiastic exhibitor at trade shows throughout the world.

Because of my interest in nongovernmental relations, I have taken the liberty of reviewing the record and background of this company in view of its undoubted success. Much of its achievement is due to the vision and ability of the two founders, Mr. Peter Munk and Mr. David Gilmour. Both have wide experience in the export-import field.

It seems to me that the extraordinary success of this company should serve as an inspiration to free enterprise everywhere. Equally important, it inevitably affects United States-Canadian relations as a source of goodwill.

In examining the development of the company, it becomes clear that its two founders, recognizing certain ills in the electronic entertainment market, embarked upon an expansive program of research. Their first models of rapid audio equipment and cabinet design won instant awards from the Canadian National Industrial Design Council. The productions were termed "outstanding in good design, on the basis of appearance, usefulness, and consumer acceptability."

The enterprising spirit of the project was, from the first, the key to success. The company stressed advanced sound engineering and simplicity of cabinet design.

The products which the Clairtone Corp. introduced were singularly attractive in appearance and of superb technical quality. They won widespread praise and evoked instant demand. The company, however, did not stand still; in 1961, Clairtone presented its first television-stereo console to the North American market. Early in 1962 the firm acquired the Middlesex Furniture Co., Ltd., a long-established manufacturing operation in Strathroy, Ontario.

The historical growth of this company exemplifies the hemispheric widening of free enterprise markets. The success of the Clairtone Corp. underlines the steady development of economic ties between Canada and the United States. Undoubtedly, this development serves the interests of both countries. It should be encouraged by public policy.

The Clairtone story represents an awareness of both economic self-interest and the resultant goodwill bred within and outside of the business community. The forward leadership of this typically fine concern reminds us anew of the great gains to be won through private economic undertakings on a world scale.

Ukrainian Freedom

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked a solemn occasion for Ukrainians everywhere, and I am proud to join in commemorating this significant date in the history of the Ukraine.

Forty-eight years have passed since that memorable day when patriotic Ukrainians proclaimed their freedom and independence after centuries of subjugation by the Russians. Tragically, their period of independence was short-lived. After 3½ years of fighting valiantly against the onslaught of the Communist techniques of propaganda, "civil war," and "liberation front," which are the weapons for the subjudgation of free people, the Ukraine was brought under the regime of the Soviet Socialistic Republic by the forces of its Communist neighbor.

Oppression, banishment, and persecution followed—but despite the sufferings visited upon them, the Ukrainian people have not lost sight of their dream of freedom. Their aspirations for self-determination and human dignity are as natural as the air we breathe. Since the dawn of history, man has longed and hoped for individual freedom and national independence. In commemorating this day of Ukrainian Independence, let us rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and to the preservation of the rights of all mankind throughout the world—and let us not forget that "freedom is the sure possession of those alone who have the courage to defend it."

Zero Defects Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 17, 1966

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in October 1964, I was invited to speak at a ceremony in San Leandro, Calif., when Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. dedicated a new numerical control machining plant.

In December 1965, I returned to the same plant to take part in another ceremony when the plant manager was presented with the coveted U.S. Air Force Zero Defects Achievement Award.

Such a fine achievement in so short a time is, I believe, worth bringing to your attention. It illustrates pride of workmanship among aerospace craftsmen. Such a pride is essential not only for the defense of our country but also for the success of our exploration of outer space.

As we rely more and more on missiles to provide the major deterrent to a nuclear attack, we are utterly dependent on the craftsmanship and dedication of all the thousands of men and women who make the components that fit into a missile. After a missile or spaceship leaves the launch pad, it cannot be repaired like the car that breaks down on a freeway.

The zero defects program aims at improving workmanship and stimulating a feeling of personal responsibility in all aerospace personnel. The program was implemented by the Air Force in February 1965, and has already saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars by reducing waste and scrap.

The program is based on the principle of defect prevention through inducement and motivation and is designed to encourage members of the defense industry to promote programs of efficiency and perfection through individuals.

Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics was one of 229 companies which pioneered the program, and on June 2, 1965, the corporation was presented with a participation award, which recognizes those companies who voluntarily agree to join the program.

The citation on the participation award reads:

> The Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp., an Air Force prime contractor and subcontractor, and its employees voluntarily established and agreed to participate in the U.S. Air Force zero defects program. Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. initiated the program on October 1, 1964, and more than 95 percent of the employees freely pledged themselves to strive constantly for improved quality of workmanship. Measurement provisions were established in three areas, and the performances record from point of inception has been fully validated.
>
> In recognition of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. employees who participated in the contractor-sponsored zero defects program and who met or exceeded those parameters established for the award, their contribution in the defense preparedness effort entitles them to the U.S. Air Force Zero Defects Program Participation Award.

Of the 259 defense contractors who have joined the zero defect program, only 65 have qualified for the participation award, and 17 for the achievement award.

The achievement award is presented to those plants which have demonstrated significant achievements or improvements against contractor-established goals.

The citation for Kaiser reads:

> Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. employees have distinguished themselves by attainment of significant achievements during the period October 1, 1964, to June 30, 1965.
>
> During this period the combined efforts of management, engineering and administration employees have significantly contributed to the achievement of a 36-percent improvement in manufacturing areas. A cost savings and cost avoidance of $169,000 was realized through the reduction of defects and the improvements in work performance.
>
> These noteworthy achievements are recognized as significant milestones in furtherance of the Air Force zero defects program objective of efficiency and perfection through people. The distinctive accomplishments by the employees of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. have reflected great credit upon themselves and have identified their corporation as a vital Air Force partner in the defense industry.

The award and citation were presented to Plant Manager Thomas W. Lee at a ceremony in San Leandro on December 21, attended by employees of the morning and afternoon shifts.

Clay P. Bedford, president of Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp., congratulated his San Leandro employees on their achievement and read a poem—a favorite of Henry J. Kaiser, the distinguished founder and head of the Kaiser enterprises. He said this caught the spirit of the vast Kaiser organization:

All have a share in the beauty,
All have a part in the plan.
What does it matter what duty
Falls to the lot of man?

Someone has blended the plaster,
And someone has carried the stone;
Neither the man nor the master
Ever has builded alone.

Making a roof from the weather,
Or building a house for the king,
Only by working together
Have men accomplished a thing.

Thomas Lee outlined the slogan contest which is held every month at the plant to popularize the zero defects program. An electric carving knife is presented to the family which suggests the best slogan. Four wives and one daughter won the first prizes, and this illustrates that the families of the employees are backing the program as well as the employees themselves.

In September, Mrs. Clara Harris, wife of Machinist Leon Harris, won the prize with the slogan: "Be it big or be it small; do it right or not at all."

In October, the best slogan of: "If perfection is the game; zero defects is the aim" won a prize for Mrs. Helen Stayrook, wife of Machinist Roy Stayrook.

In November, it was Mrs. Brigida Valle, wife of Inspector Juaquin Valle, who won with the slogan: "Zero defects is our goal; full speed ahead let her roll."

The December award was won jointly by Miss Dixie Ding, daughter of Helen Ding, and Mrs. Jeanne Turnage, wife of Materials Manager William Turnage. Miss Ding's slogan was: "Get in the groove and really swing; go zero defects in everything."

And Mrs. Turnage coined:

"To stop those little defects,
To stop those big ones too,
To prevent all of the rejects
Zero Defects is the clue."

Col. W. K. Ashby, director of quality assurance and head of the zero defects program for the San Francisco region, pointed out that Kaiser won the achievement award in record time.

Brig. Gen. Daniel E. Riley, U.S. Air Force, commanding general of Air Force Contracts Management Division at Los Angeles, presented the award, congratulated Kaiser employees and said it was a fine example of team spirit.

We all benefit from your work—

He said.

> There comes a moment of truth during the blastoff of a missile, when the value of zero defects comes home to us.
>
> This award is to recognize the part you all play in the defense of our country. Do not relax now. When we say "zero defects," we really mean zero. That is our aim. That is what we are training our sights on.
>
> I would like to challenge you all to go one stage further and make a bid for the craftsmanship award—the highest in the zero defects program.
>
> This will be presented to the contractor and his employees for a combination of sustained performance and outstanding achievements in such activities as cost reduction, product reliability, safety, reduction of errors, and amount of scrap.

In my brief remarks, I observed:

> If we can be sure that each missile is so constructed that it contains no defects, and if every plane that flies through the skies is flawless because every man, who helped to make the parts, gave of his best, then we would be a happy nation.
>
> The Kaiser organization can be proud of you. I want to thank you all on behalf of the Government.

In addition to its production of aircraft parts, solid rocket nozzles for the Minuteman and Polaris programs and spaceship components, Kaiser Aerospace & Electronics Corp. produces the Kaiser Flite-Path system—an advanced system of aircraft cockpit instrumentation—at Palo Alto, Calif., for Grumman Aircraft Corp., for use in Navy planes.

The company has an electronics plant at Phoenix, Ariz., which produces ground support equipment for the Kaiser Flite-Path and has recently entered a new field, community antenna television equipment.

The Great Society Must Not Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Hans Steinitz, the acting editor of Aufbau has written an article about the Great Society which makes it clear that Aufbau will continue its progressive, humanitarian tradition.

In underlining the responsibility of this great country to provide butter no matter how fast it produces guns, Mr. Steinitz speaks to all of the Aufbau's readers who know all too well the cost of war. As he says, "The Great Society Must Not Die." His article, which appeared in the January 21 issue of Aufbau, follows:

[From Aufbau, Jan. 21, 1966]

THE GREAT SOCIETY MUST NOT DIE

(By Hans Steinitz)

> In his recent message on the state of the Union, the President of the United States has presented his plan of action for 1966. It includes military measures to stop aggression in southeast Asia, and it includes as well numerous domestic programs of social improvement and overdue liberal reform. Straightforward and courageous, the President is fighting for his conviction that both are equally necessary, and that this Nation cannot afford to stand still and forget its social progress and liberal improvement programs engaged upon last year.
>
> The President admits that we are faced with the hard and ugly problem of our military commitments in Vietnam and that more men, more weapons, more military hardware, more sweat and more money may be required to cope with it. He admits that last year, when he presented his first state of the Union message after his overwhelming election victory, the horizon looked brighter and the chances for his broad pro-

gram of social reforms were better. He got them through Congress, all right, in the course of a congressional session full of dynamic vigor and historical achievements—and the danger is imminent that this year things may turn out differently.

The spokesmen of the Republican opposition have just announced their plans to do their utmost to stop all further progress toward a Great Society right here and now—because, you see, social progress is expensive, it is luxury, and we cannot afford it in harsh times of war, when priority must be given to all elementary purchases of survival and military necessity. Who wants to embellish our highways and our landscape, when our boys are bleeding in a faraway jungle? Who wants to rebuild our big cities and spend more tax money for social insurance, when all we need are more tanks and more guns? Who wants to dream about the vision of a Great Society when Peiping-trained Communists are up and about to take over the whole of Asia?

Well, yes, we keep dreaming about the Great Society, and we think its forward march should not be slowed down. Yes, we keep thinking about social security and the removal of slums and the fight against air pollution, and we think the more we improve life in this country, the better are our chances to defend it against all comers. Yes, we agree with the President of the United States who proclaimed proudly that this country is indeed mighty enough to do both, the defense of our way of life abroad, and the fight for a better life at home.

Yes, we rally behind the President in his courageous double endeavors to help protecting our allies and friends—and go on helping our old people as well, our sick people, our victims of poverty and ignorance right here in our own country's backyard.

There are the economy boys in Congress lamenting the expenditures and doubting our capacity of paying all these bills, and their only wisdom is, as it always was, to cut down all programs and governmental actions designed to improve the lot of those who have trouble helping themselves.

They have always been wrong, and they are wrong now: our economy is in reasonably good shape, our labor force is increasing, our tax income is rising, our budgetary deficit is stationary or even shrinking; and every dollar spent for the pursuit of happiness creates new jobs, new income, and new tax revenue.

Let the opponents of Federal aid to education and of federally supported medicare beware. There are plenty of people around who don't believe that for the sake of our war effort in Asia all elementary actions of simple decency have to be cut out, destroyed, trampled down, torn asunder, and our vision of 20th century social solidarity to be reduced to the happy-go-lucky level of the gay nineties.

The war in Vietnam is too serious a business to permit the forces of yesteryear to use it as a pretext for evil purpose. The Great Society must not die, and its progress not be allowed to be arrested.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Code of Laws of the United States

Title 44, Section 181. Congressional Record; arrangement, style, contents, and indexes.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the Congressional Record, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the Congressional Record semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

Title 44, Section 182b. Same; illustrations, maps, diagrams.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the Record without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the Congressional Record the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily Record as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the Record shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the Congressional Record, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the Record shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the Record issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the Record for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the Record of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the Record shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the Record style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the Record.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent Record is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the Congressional Record the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the Congressional Record.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the Congressional Record shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the Congressional Record, nor to Records printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the Congressional Record by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the Congressional Record which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

The 142d Anniversary of the Birth of Stonewall Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Friday of last week was the 142d anniversary of the birth of one of America's most illustrious sons—Gen. Thomas Jonathan Jackson. On January 21, 1824, Thomas Jonathan Jackson—later known to his troops and to the world as "Stonewall"—was born in the western region of Virginia in what is now the city of Clarksburg, W. Va.

We are all keenly aware of Jackson's numerous accomplishments during the Civil War. Feats of battlefield genius which prompted the great Victorian military leader, Field Marshall Viscount Wolseley to comment:

> The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American.

I shall not enumerate the historical events associated with the era in which he lived nor recall his brilliant tactics on the battlefield which gained him this world acclaim.

But I am inclined to comment briefly on certain aspects of "Stonewall" Jackson's character. It has been a matter of deep concern to me that too often we have stressed the methodical and rigid nature of this outstanding West Virginian. We have heard on many occasions the story of Jackson sitting the entire night in the superintendent's waiting room at VMI because the superintendent forgot their appointment and left by another door. Also, there have been printed and reprinted articles on what many persons have termed his "religious fanaticism." Lest this idea of the so-called inflexibility of the Jackson character go uncorrected, I submit today several excerpts from his own writing and that of historians.

In his letters from Mexico, shortly after his graduation from West Point, Jackson noted:

> The morning hours I occupy in studies and business, and generally taking a walk after dinner, and sometimes a ride on the Paseo. * * * The book I am now studying is Lord Chesterfield's letters to his son translated into Spanish; so that whilst I am obtaining his thoughts, I am also acquiring a knowledge of the Spanish tongue. * * * Subsequent to this I shall study Shakespeare's work.

Can this be the comment of a person with limited interests?

After the birth of his daughter, Jackson wrote to his wife:

> Don't you regard it as the most precious little treasure in the world? Do not spoil it, and don't let anybody tease it. Don't permit it to have a bad temper. * * * Give her many kisses for her father.

At a later date, he wrote:

> I am glad to hear that she enjoys outdoors, and grows, and coos, and laughs. How I would love her sweet ways. That her little hands have lost their resemblance to mine is not regretted by me.

Certainly, these comments in "Stonewall" Jackson's letters are revealing and dispel the idea of his complete rigidity and stern nature. His correspondence to his wife concerning her absence and the new child provides substantial evidence of the human side of this famous general. Burke Davis, author of "They Called Him Stonewall," gives us considerable insight into Jackson's capacity for light banter and moments of gaiety. This book on Jackson is excellent reading.

Tangible examples of a more rounded and more logical man are found in the writings of Lenoir Chambers, another prominent biographer of Jackson.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that extracts from an address by Mr. Chambers at a Stonewall Jackson commemorative dinner in Richmond, Va., in 1963, together with an article from the Clarksburg, W. Va., Exponent of January 21, 1966, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY LENOIR CHAMBERS AT "STONEWALL" JACKSON COMMEMORATIVE DINNER, RICHMOND, VA., MAY 1, 1963

Before Jackson had completed 10 years at Virginia Military Institute, where assuredly he was no real success as a teacher of physics, he had written a record of another kind, he had bought a home and a farm. He had bought other real estate for investment. He owned stock in a tannery. He had traveled widely, nearly always in Northern States, once in Europe. He had married twice, each time to the daughter of a college president. He had decided to join the Presbyterian Church, and he more than met his responsibilities there.

He could make a political speech. He had been elected to the board of directors of the oldest bank in Rockbridge County, and there he sat with half a dozen of the town's best known and most respected businessmen. Obviously some people thought the major was more than "Fool Tom Jackson."

The second package of evidence discloses that this general, who sometimes made officers angry could attract and hold a remarkable group of staff officers and aides.

The character, capacity, and versatility of these officers was not easy to match on any other staff among Confederate generals. Their presence at this headquarters—the most important of them for virtually the whole 2 years—suggests something more than administrative impracticality at the top.

For a third package we have the evidence of General Jackson's fondness for men in public life—for politicians if you will—and their fondness for him, and their large role in his career.

The list of those men leaves no doubt that as a boy, as a young officer, as a teacher, and as a general, Jackson was at home with politicians, knew their values and their ways, and understood with them the fine art of the possible.

These characteristics deserve a place beside the sometimes more frequently recalled fondness for theological discussion and even the delight in the company of gentle old ladies.

It would never do to try to write General Jackson down as a bench philosopher only—not this man of action, not this personification of the aggressive spirit, not this general-on-the-move who made time his ally and surprise and deception his aids, not this creator—rather than follower—of precedent.

Nor would it ever do to ignore those manifestations of the Jackson personality which are his alone just as some of his movements in the field were his alone.

STONEWALL JACKSON WAS BORN IN CLARKSBURG 142 YEARS AGO TODAY

Today marks the 142d anniversary of the birth of Gen. Thomas Jonathan "Stonewall" Jackson, born in Clarksburg, January 21, 1824.

S. J. Birshtein, chairman of the Stonewall Jackson Historical Committee of the chamber of commerce, informed the press that two local organizations are honoring the occasion with appropriate wreaths.

The United Daughters of the Confederacy have placed a wreath on both the Stonewall equestrian statue and on the bronze plaque erected on the site in the 300 block of West Main Street where the famous general was born.

The Stonewall Jackson Civic Club has remembered the 142d anniversary by placing a wreath on the striking equestrian statue located on the plaza of the Harrison County Courthouse.

The Clarksburg chapter of the UDC erected the bronze plaque in August 1911 to commemorate the famous general's birthplace. On May 10, 1953, the equestrian statue was dedicated.

The magnificent work of art was sculptured by the late Charles Keck of New York and the base of the statue was designed by William Grant, Clarksburg architect.

Birshtein furnished the press with the following information regarding Clarksburg's great general and renowned military tactician:

Clarkburg's brilliant officer during the War Between the States acquired the sobriquet or nickname of "Stonewall" with the stubborn defense of his 1st brigade in the first Battle of Manassas (Bull Run) on July 21, 1861.

Gen. Barnard E. Bee in rallying his men exclaimed "See, there stands Jackson like a stone wall." A near rout for the Confederate forces was turned into an overwhelming victory. Throughout the Confederacy and the world he became "Stonewall Jackson" from that moment on.

General Jackson was one of the ablest of the Confederate officers, and was probably the greatest corps commander on either side during the war. He had a deeply religious nature and has often been compared with the Cromwellian leaders in England, historians contend.

He deprecated secession but was a strong believer in States rights, and when Virginia withdrew from the Union he maintained his allegiance to the State.

The military tactics of "Stonewall" Jackson are studied at West Point, Virginia Military Institute, Fort Knox, in St. Cyr, France, and at Sandhurst, England. It is said to be the consensus of military experts that his genius has seldom been equaled and never surpassed.

One of the finest tributes to "Stonewall" was sent in a telegram by the great general of World War II, Douglas MacArthur, at the unveiling of the bronze bust of "Stonewall" in the Hall of Fame at New York University, May 19, 1957:

"Perhaps the most prized message I ever received came from the famous historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, who wrote me at the close of my campaigns in the Southwest Pacific area of World War II, 'The mantle of Robert E. Lee and "Stonewall" Jackson has now fallen on your shoulders.' "

Two of "Stonewall's" favorite maxims are "You may be whatever you resolve to be" and "Never take counsel of your fears."

Birshtein said that few persons in West Virginia realize that the Clarksburg Public Library has an original letter by Stonewall. This letter is on exhibit together with a miniature replica of the Polaris submarine, the *Stonewall Jackson,* and other diversified mementos dealing with General Jackson.

Miss Charlotte Bailey, librarian, has extended an invitation to the public to visit the Clarksburg Public Library and examine the Jackson items being displayed.

Also on display is an excellent sketch by Bruce Haymond of Jackson's birthplace (234–328 West Main Street) now occupied by a mercantile store. The sketch graphically reveals a neat 3-room brick cottage with semiattic and inset porch, of a type now fast disappearing.

A large oil painting by David Van Pelt is also on exhibit in the library. This painting of Stonewall is by Edwin F. Draughman and is a fine copy of the famous original by John A. Elder in the Corcoran Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C.

A ladderback rocker which belonged to Stonewall's mother can also be seen in the library.

The original letter by Jackson was presented to the library by the late D. H. Hill Arnold of Elkins, grandnephew of Stonewall.

The letter, postmarked West Point, is addressed to Jackson's sister, Mrs. L. (Laura) A. Arnold of Beverly, Randolph County.

Stonewall wrote his sister of his preparations for the annual examination at West Point and reported that his health was "very good at the present." He requested that his sister inform him as to the subscription rates of "the Democratic paper published in Clarksburg."

Jackson's paternal grandparents, his father Jonathan, and Stonewall's sister Elizabeth, are buried in the historic cemetery located in Jackson Park located on East Pike Street in Clarksburg.

The general's mother is buried in Ansted, W. Va. His sister, Laura, is buried in Buckhannon, and his brother Warren is buried near that city.

Stonewall Jackson died May 10, 1863, at the age of 39, near Guinea Station, Va., and is buried in Lexington, Va. He had led the army corps around Hooker's flank at the battle of Chancellorsville, routing the right wing of the Federal army.

He was wounded and died of pneumonia.

His death was a severe blow to Gen. Robert E. Lee and the Southern cause. Jackson was a religious man who always prayed before battle. He was a tactician of the first rank and although a strict disciplinarian, was popular with his men. He was Lee's ablest and most trusted lieutenant.

Police Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. Peter P. Lejins, was recently named by President Johnson to serve as a resource person to the United Nations on matters pertaining to American criminological techniques. I am personally acquainted with Dr. Lejins, who serves on the faculty of the University of Maryland, and have had occasion to benefit from his vast knowledge in the field of criminology. I am extremely pleased that he will be representing our country in world councils. To give you some idea of the caliber and quality of his background and philosophy, I commend the following article, which appeared in the January 17, 1966, issue of the Baltimore Sun, to your attention:

POLICE PROPHECY

(By Lowell E. Sunderland)

Around Christmas a couple of years back, Baltimore was searching its soul about an annual crime wave. During all the talk about what to do about crime and how things certainly weren't what they used to be, someone turned to a gray-haired, glasses-wearing professor at the University of Maryland and asked for some consoling thoughts.

"I think the main point—that something may be wrong with the basic program of law enforcement—remains untouched," was the professor's answer. The professor was Dr. Peter P. Lejins.

Dr. Lejins was then, and is now, an internationally respected criminologist whose ideas and advice are sought—although not always heeded—by all levels of government. The 56-year Latvian-born professor heads the criminology program in the university's sociology department. He has been on the faculty since 1941.

REVOLUTIONARY STEPS

His answer was not consoling, and although he was not talking then specifically about Baltimore, his answer proved almost prophetic in the city's case. The recent charges of mismanagement and inefficiency leveled at the city's police department fall right in line with Dr. Lejins's thinking.

It is his contention that police departments have fallen behind the times. "Police departments must continually modernize themselves," he explained the other day. "If a department becomes entrenched in the ways of the past, then the problems will have to be solved by revolutionary steps, and not in the revolutionary steps which would be to the departments' interests."

Added to this failure to keep up with modern thinking, police departments in general are also being confronted with sharp changes in society, he said. "Ours is an urban, mass society today. It prevents different problems than when towns were isolated from one another. Too few large police departments have apparently realized this fact."

BASIC REVISIONS

By this very fact alone, Dr. Lejins said, "it is clear that there are some areas of law enforcement which might need very basic revisions."

A squarely set man with a firm voice and a steady, probing gaze, Dr. Lejins is every inch an academician. He admits it. "I'm very cautious," he said, "very academic."

He talks crime in broad, theoretical terms, and when he talks people listen. What he says comes from long study and observation as a scholar whose background includes extensive work in sociology and law, as well as thorough training in criminology.

He is considered by many to be the leading authority on crime statistics in the Nation. In line with this, he was chairman of a three-man panel which in 1958 revised the methods of reporting in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's "uniform crime reports," the most reliable American crime statistics.

He still serves as a consultant to the FBI, as well as to the U.S. Department of Defense.

STATISTICS UNUSED

It would appear obvious that accurate statistics should help increase the quality of law enforcement. Yet nationally, Dr. Lejins said, "crime statistics are not what they should be, a very painstaking operation." And many departments which keep statistics of sorts are not using them.

"The cities are getting more and more reliable," the professor said. "But even this has happened only in the past 10 or so years. Gradually procedures are being standardized, but a lot of improvements are needed."

He pointed out, for example, that there are no criminal court records kept on a national basis, none on parole and probation and only a small sampling of individual "crime career records," which he calls the "dream of all criminologists." This latter sampling has been kept for about 3 years by the FBI.

One of Dr. Lejins's prime concerns today is the recognition of criminology as a profession unto itself. "Criminology is divided among the professions now," he said. Sociology and psychology claim it as part of their realm. "There is no agreement on a system of instruction."

He visualizes a criminology program starting at the undergraduate level, "just as is done in chemistry and political science, for instance," and continuing through the graduate levels.

Along these lines, Dr. Lejins is vice chairman of a national committee expecting a $2,100,000 Federal grant. The committee will begin next month exploring means of resolving "the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation."

Dr. Lejins sees as the only answer to coping with rising crime rates "professionalization of both the police and correctional agencies." To accomplish this would require "more training, education and all the devices that go toward making a profession."

He is critical of promotion policies with police departments across the Nation. Promoting to higher ranks from within a system only serves to enhance the system's weaknesses, he said.

RECRUITING SHIFT

Instead, he suggests recruitment of "middle rung officers" from other police departments, thus providing a national movement of thought in police work. He also advocates starting men with high levels of education in police work at ranks higher than patrolman.

"This would stimulate educational ambitions among police," he said, admitting however, that "this is practically impossible at this time."

Since coming to Maryland in 1941, Dr. Lejins has been active constantly in correctional matters of the State. He holds two gubernatorial appointments on the boards of the Maryland Training School for Boys and the Maryland Commission for Children and Youth. He is also an adviser to the Patuxent Institute and has served as chief adviser of the Maryland children's centers for 6 years. He is a former president of the Maryland Prisoners Aid Association.

He evaluates Maryland as "always being a fairly progressive state" in correctional matters, "progressive but streaky." The Patuxent Institute, where convicted criminals get psychiatric help, and the children's centers are progressive thinking, he asserts.

ALCOHOLIC ISSUE

But he chides the State for lagging in physical facilities (overcrowding at the Maryland Penitentiary, for example).

He is especially interested in the alcoholic, arguing that the problem is medical in nature and not criminal. "The general public lacks any idea of the magnitude of this problem," he contended, adding that putting a drunk in jail has proven itself to be "completely ineffective."

Another matter which concerns Dr. Lejins is what he calls "youthful crime," as distinguished from juvenile delinquency. "This is an international problem, you know," he said. "Even the Iron Curtain countries are finally admitting it now. They call it 'hooliganism.' "

"Youthful crime"—performed by persons 16 to 25 years old—was the main item of talk last August at the International Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders sponsored by the United Nations in Stockholm.

Dr. Lejins, incidentally, has been a U.S. delegate at these conventions, which meet every 5 years, since their start in 1950.

NEW U.N. POSITION

The University of Maryland professor, who came to the United States from Latvia in 1940, will have more to do with the United Nations now. Last month, over the signature of President Johnson, he was appointed one of three American correspondents to the United Nations in the area of "social defense." His term expires in December 1970.

"What it means is that I am to be a resource person for American methods and policies in criminology," he explained.

The list of his honors is extensive. Dr. Lejins is a former president of the 1,500-member American Correctional Association and is currently chairman of its research council.

He is a onetime president of the District of Columbia Sociological Society and has served as a member of the executive committee of the American Sociological Association. He is a member of the professional and research councils of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Too, he has been active in Prince Georges County affairs on the same subjects.

He writes prolificly in criminology, and his work keeps him traveling. This weekend, he was in New York for a Government-sponsored meeting.

ADDED DEGREES

With masters degrees in philosophy and law from the University of Latvia, Dr. Lejins earned the Ph. D. in sociology from the University of Chicago under a Rockefeller Foundation grant.

After studying in Chicago, he returned to more study at the University of Paris in law and criminology. He makes his home in College Park, and his wife, Nora, is assistant chief of the division of languages for the State Department.

His tiny office on the second floor of Taliaferro Hall at the university is lined with heavily laden filing cabinets and orderly bookcases. A part-time secretary has her own desk.

The office, however, contains a hint that Dr. Lejins can sometimes be less than clinical. Three spindly trees—a California pine, a rare pine from Nepal, and a Japanese tree—stand almost ceiling high in wooden pots. On a window ledge is a hefty looking Bougainvillia.

Asked about them, Dr. Lejins smiled and said somewhat sheepishly: "Those are my hobby. I have a three-acre arboretum at home. That's what I could really get lost in."

Jonathan Winters for President?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the Record an article from the Northwest Arkansas Times of January 24, 1966, by Allan Gilbert, Jr., entitled "Jonathan Winters for President?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Jonathan Winters for President?

(By Allan Gilbert, Jr.)

Even if he were alive today and living in California, you don't think for a minute that Abe Lincoln would vote for Ronald Reagan, do you? Not after his experience at the theater.

And that's not all.

The disclosure recently that certain Texas interests have been urging Greer Garson (who is married to a wealthy Texan) to run for senator in that State indicates to me that we have a potentially dangerous trend on our hands. If Paul Revere lived down the street from me I would be tempted to ask him to gallop down to the courthouse and hang up a lantern.

The idea of the professional thespian prolonging his career by entering politics somehow has an insidious ring to me. Yul Brynner, for instance, may look the part, but would he make a good circuit judge? The Three Stooges look like they'd make a good city-street committee, too, but the proof is in the doing, and I have the feeling that most actors' political talents would end on election day. That's the insidious part.

With a good set of dentures, courtesy of the studio, and a clever writer, there is little question that an actor has a better than even chance to win a lot of votes in any election. Such a response comes ready made by way of television and the ad man.

The late Dick Powell, for instance, could have been a powerful candidate for Governor of Arkansas, had he lived, and had he been inclined to file for that office. (Bob Burns, on the other hand, probably wouldn't have fared nearly so well against the present Governor since their styles are so similar.)

Winthrop Rockefeller admits these days that he was ill at ease and unprofessional in his televised appeal for votes in the last gubernatorial campaign. He has, with professional guidance, worked on this, and secured a good deal of polish, since last time around.

No announcement has been made as yet, but it stands to reason that Win will add some sort of entertainer or actor to his program for the hot days of this summer's campaign. Buddy Epson and Jayne Mansfield, for instance, might provide a better-rounded campaign program than, say, Willis Ricketts and Cy Carney, Jr.

On the local scene there appears to be very little of the bard in any of the directional candidates, but Dave Burleson, who has announced for Congress, is an old bass fiddle player. Burleson, in fact, has picked his fiddle with a wide variety of bands dating back to his days in the famous varsity club at the university.

It is possible that he will form some sort of tasty little combo this summer to jazz things up when Representative Jim Trimble is busy talking politics.

A few choruses of "Up a Lazy River" would be in the best political traditions, I'd think.

Of course if Burleson uses the "River" bit, Uncle Jim can be expected to secure the services of an old-fashioned choir for a few renditions of that wonderful old refrain: "My Time Is Your Time."

It's hard to beat a tune like that.

The worst, of course, may still be on the other side of the hill as far as any marriage of politics and entertainment is concerned. There hasn't, for instance, been any sort of effort to "cast" the candidates yet.

California's George Murphy, for instance, would hardly be the man you'd expect Cecil B. DeMille to hire as lead in an epic on constitutional law. Neither, for that matter, would the smiley Mr. Reagan be expected to win if John Ford decided to film a sequel to "The Last Hurrah."

Without doing a lot of research, it seems relatively obvious that even if Ralph Bellamy and Raymond Massey are potentially the presidential type, Mickey Rooney and George Raft aren't. You can probably think of certain actors that would be great for mayor, Governor, director or dogcatcher, and some that just wouldn't do at all.

Therefore, proper casting holds a hidden power over our Government that few may yet realize. Think what a vote-getting combination a ticket headed by Spencer Tracy, John Wayne, James Cagney, and Fabian would be. Contrast that with a ticket headed by Dean Martin and Sam Davis, Jr.

Bias of National Labor Relations Board Discussed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a very important report was presented to the Members of Congress from Alabama at the annual Washington meeting of the Associated Industries of Alabama. This report, dealing with the prolabor record of the National Labor Relations Board, was presented by Mr. Peyton Finch, vice president, U.S. Pipe & Foundry Co., of Birmingham. I include it in the Record to enable all Members of Congress to consider the points Mr. Finch makes.

Statement in the Industrial Relations Field Presented Before the Alabama Congressional Delegation, by Peyton Finch, Vice President, U.S. Pipe & Foundry Co., Birmingham, Ala., January 24, 1966

Subject: National Labor Relations Board.

In discussing the prolabor bias of the National Labor Relations Board, one must begin with the original Board which was established by Presidential Executive Order 6763 on June 29, 1934, and continued by the National Labor Relations Act of July 5, 1935.

In the 1930's the employees of the regional offices of the Board had little to do; therefore, they aided the organizing efforts of unions by obtaining signatures on authorization cards.

To really understand how the Board felt about the National Labor Relations Act, you need only to read the words of J. Warren Madden, Chairman of the NLRB in 1937, in an address to the U.S. conference of mayors, delivered on November 16, 1937, in Washington, D.C.; or read the words of Board member Edwin S. Smith in an address before the International Judicial Association in New York on January 15, 1938. Mr. Madden stated: "The condition of the law in placing all legal responsibility for labor troubles upon the workers who were frequently the victims of the real wrong, and were obliged to get into the street to preserve their self-respect, was a public scandal and was recognized by Congress as such.

It therefore provided that there should be some law for employers, to accompany the large amount of existing law for employees. Mr. Smith stated: "The Wagner Act was passed to remedy a major evil in American life. Our social system was suffering gravely because employers in powerful positions were preventing their employees from exercising their right to join and assist labor organizations. It is now seriously proposed that the law shall be made equal by imposing new and crushing burdens on unions. It is time to recognize such hypocrisy for what it is. It has too frequently happened that legislation designed to aid one economic group has rebounded to the benefit of another; this has been particularly true of legislation designed to aid labor."

Thinking such as that expressed by Messrs. Madden and Smith continued up to and through 1947 when the NLRB was amended by the Taft-Hartley Act. In fact, one Board member resigned because he did not believe in the philosophy expressed in Taft-Hartley.

After Taft-Hartley, what happened? A study of the Board's history after 1947 gives this answer rather clearly; and to understand the happenings, one must look at some cold facts. These facts are as follows:

First, the first act was passed because of union pressure on Congress.

Second, Taft-Hartley was passed because management convinced Congress that the unions had talked it into going too far.

Third, the union pressure on Congress was as heavy as ever—probably heavier.

Fourth, the law was amended but the Board and its employees did not materially change. This meant that the same attitudes adopted during the period they were carrying out the provisions of a bill designed strictly for labor continued to exist after an attempt was made to balance the scales.

Fifth, these employees of the Board realize that the reason for their existence lies in labor unions. The percentage of cases brought to the Board by companies is low as compared to those brought by labor. Management would never bring a case to the Board unless a union forced them to do so.

Sixth, it is a truism of the democratic process that political appointees tend to favor the group which they feel is responsible for their appointment.

Now, after the background information set out above, there are a great many people who are not knowledgeable in this field, and they might ask why management throughout the United States feels that the National Labor Relations Board is prolabor. By taking a look at the restrictions and limitations placed upon management in the following areas, one can readily determine why the feeling persists:

1. The area of mandatory bargaining.
2. The limitations put on management's preelection speeches and propaganda.
3. The determination of appropriate units for bargaining.
4. The techniques used by the Board for differentiating between organizational and publicity picketing.
5. The techniques used for differentiating between secondary and primary strike action.
6. The decisions of the Board concerning lockouts, even when used to counterbalance strike threats or actions.
7. The techniques used by the Board for resolving and minimizing jurisdictional disputes.
8. The creation of remedies that supposedly give more protection to the rights of self-organization and discourage unfair labor practices. These remedies normally arise from some isolated incident but the Board applies the same rules to everyone after such an incident.

Let's take a look at the evidence of prounion bias the Board has evidenced in the past few years. If you will remember, during the Eisenhower administration with the so-called Eisenhower Board, the members of the Board dismissed an unfair labor practice charge in the now famous Fibreboard case. Over a year later when the Kennedy appointees were placed on the Board, the case was reconsidered and the Board ordered reinstatement and back pay because the company had not bargained about this subcontracting matter. Of course, the Supreme Court in 1964 finally felt that the Board had the authority to order reinstatement and back pay but the Court also stressed that its opinion was reached on the facts in this particular case and did not encompass other forms of contracting out or subcontracting which arise daily.

After the Board's wrists had been slightly slapped by the Supreme Court, the Board came along in the Westinghouse case and laid down some subcontracting ground rules. This approach seemed to be an attempt to appease the Court, but a close look at these ground rules will bring out the prounion bias of the Board.

If you will remember, in the Darlington Mills case the Board held that it was an unfair labor practice for a company to go out of business without bargaining with its union about the matter, or to go out of business in an attempt to defeat unionization. This seems to be another definite attempt to show prolabor bias. Why should a company have to bargain with a union about a management decision not to put any more money into a business, or not to continue taking the risk involved in doing business? It is well to note that here again the Supreme Court disagreed with the Board and overruled their decision. In the Supreme Court's decision, the Court stated: "The termination of part of a multiplant enterprise will violate the Taft-Hartley Act if its purpose is to chill unionism in the remaining parts of the business if the employer can reasonably foresee that the partial closing will have that effect." On October 25, 1965, the Labor Board reopened the case to receive additional evidence to bear on the "purpose" and "effect" of the closing of the Darlington Mill. There is not a shadow of a doubt as to what the Board's decision will be after they have received this evidence.

In the recent Brown Foods case, having to do with lockouts, the Board stated that it is an unfair labor practice when members of a multiemployer bargaining unit lock out their employees and continue to operate with temporary replacements even though the union used whipsawing tactics and called a strike against one member of the group. Here again is prounion bias. Here again the Supreme Court disagreed with the Board's ruling.

In the recent American Shipbuilding Co. case, the Board stated that an employer did not have the right after negotiations have reached an impasse to temporarily close his plant and lay off employees for the sole purpose of bringing economic pressure to bear in support of his legitimate bargaining position. Again, prounion bias. Again, the Supreme Court disagreed with the Board's ruling.

You can look at many of the recent Supreme Court decisions and you will find that they have disagreed with the Board's biased attempts to rule in favor of labor unions.

Any legislation which attempts to remove bias and prejudice from rulings of the NLRB, whether that bias be for business or labor, will be wholly favored by the Associated Industries of Alabama. We hope that you, our Representatives, will take a long, favorable look at Representative Robert Griffin's bill—H.R. 11217—which will bring impartiality to NLRB decisions.

Edward Marcus, Texas Alliance for Progress Head, Cited by State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Edward Marcus of Dallas, chairman of the Inter-American Coordinating Committee of the Partners of the Alliance, has been awarded the first "Partners of the Alliance Leadership" award by Jack Hood Vaughn, retiring Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator for the Alliance for Progress.

I am proud that this award has been given to a leader in the Alliance for Progress program of my home State of Texas, as the Texas-Peru Alliance has been marked by many successful programs and mutual benefits. Mr. Marcus has turned his large business talents to the field of aiding our international work with Latin America.

To illustrate the progress we have made and the success of the Texas-Peru Alliance, I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post article of Wednesday, January 26, 1966, entitled "Inter-American Salesman Cited" be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Inter-American Salesman Cited

(By Lorraine Barnes)

The State Department presented a first of its kind citation yesterday to a famous fashion merchandiser who also works as a salesman for the Alliance for Progress.

"It makes a very full life," said Edward Marcus, explaining how he manages to be, at one and the same time, executive vice president of Dallas' Neiman-Marcus specialty shops and chairman of the Inter-American Coordinating Committee of the Partners of the Alliance.

The Alliance program gets its members weekends and vacations and often a good bit more, Marcus said. He explained he has been to Peru twice and Costa Rica once in the past year and, come to think of it, is going back to Peru on Sunday.

Jack Hood Vaughn, retiring Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs and U.S. Coordinator, Alliance for Progress, gave the Partners of the Alliance Leadership Award to Marcus in a ceremony in Vaughn's office.

Similar citations will go to other leaders from time to time, a spokesman said.

Vaughn said Marcus was actually a triple chairman, since he also heads the partners in Texas and served as chairman of the first Inter-American Partners Conference.

"I have high hopes for the partners program because of people like you," Vaughn declared, emphasizing the volunteer aspect of Marcus' service. "If I have had a certain amount of preoccupation with the partners program it's because I understand what volunteer operations require in spirit and service and what they accomplish."

Vaughn's appointment to direct the Peace Corps was announced by the White House last week.

In an interview, Marcus told how the Alliance partnership is working for Texas and Peru.

The Texas Hospital Association is making an inventory of surplus equipment; a Peruvian hospital will check what it needs on the inventory and the equipment will be delivered without cost. Also, Marcus said, four Texas doctors will spend their vacations working in a Peruvian charity hospital.

There may be significant developments in the next few months in the program of encouraging Americans to go into business in Peru. Marcus expects construction projects and a textile mill to be among projects that with reenforce their economy.

The time he spends in Latin America is having a secondary effect on Neiman-Marcus, its vice president said. He explained that his and other U.S. stores become aware of beautiful Latin American products.

Marcus summed the project up by stating, "The money being spent is not large and it isn't nearly so important as the number of people involved.

"We are for the partnership idea because it's hard to get mad at somebody you're making money with."

Why Peace Plans Not Working in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an editorial which appeared in the Peoria Journal Star on January 25:

WHY PEACE PLANS NOT WORKING IN VIETNAM

Well, we've had our Christmas truce and our Lunar New Year's truce, and have held back our bombers from North Vietnam for weeks. We have scattered high-ranking officials around the world in a peace offensive, and we've had a new outbreak of senatorial silliness and "peace" pitches.

And what has been physically accomplished?

The Vietcong murdered a flock of civilian refugees, assassinated a couple of village chiefs, and made numerous attacks on United States and Korean forces, notably in South Vietnam.

In North Vietnam, they energetically moved in more missiles and antiaircraft guns taking full advantage of the opportunity we graciously gave them. Meanwhile British and other international vessels, plus Communist vessels, continue to unload the materials for killing American troops at Haiphong and in the upper Mekong.

Between North and South Vietnam, free from aerial attack, new heavier weapons, and new fighting forces moved down to where they can kill Americans and shoot down our helicopters and aircraft more readily.

Our troops, under order, stood by, guns silent, while these preparations went forward. Our pilots held fire while watching the means for their own destruction being erected.

This is the painful reality.

Meanwhile, we did not lose any planes or pilots over North Vietnam for a while, it's true. By keeping them home and using mostly photo drones, we kept the planes intact and the pilots alive.

We had lost almost 200 planes so far attacking second-rate targets there—operating under wraps. But if and as they go back, it is apt to be a lot tougher than before. The sites for missiles and guns that were smashed have had time and freedom to rebuild, and new ones have been added.

Instead of keeping the numbers down by smashing those under construction and thus maintaining the costly gains of putting them out of action in the first place, we now have that whole job to do over again if we are to resume action in the North.

Such is the peace victory we have won. Such is what has been accomplished by the miracle men who saw peace as attainable if we would just seek it and show our good intentions.

Now, as evidence of their good intentions, the Vietcong threatens to murder American prisoners of war, while urging new and harder blows against us—as they have been doing all through the peace talk and truce.

The Vietcong has said there is no peace this side of total surrender and the complete abandonment of South Vietnam into their hands by the U.S. forces. The North Vietnam Government has said over and over, again and again, and is still saying there is no peace this side of total surrender and complete abandonment of that part of the world by U.S. forces.

Red China has said and is saying, over and over, that there is no peace this side of U.S. surrender and abandonment of the people of southeast Asia.

Even "friendly" Russia has repeatedly said and is saying, there is no peace this side of U.S. surrender and abandonment of southeast Asia.

We have advised them all and every neutral government in between and every other capital in the world that we would negotiate unconditionally. The Communist countries have all replied, over and over, "No; surrender first. Get out first."

We have advised them all that we would stop our bombing and remove our troops if they would stop sending troops and guns south from North Vietnam. They have spit on us.

These are the unpleasant facts, and why and how do people manage to cheerfully pretend they do not exist, and to read what they wish "between the lines" of messages written in hate and print and blood so plainly and so often and so categorically?

It is painfully clear that any time the Communists are willing to deal and really want to negotiate, or enjoy a truce, or whatever—they have only to hold up one finger and we will come running and panting to seize the opportunity.

But no finger is raised.

What then is all this pompous gibberish about "new steps" on our part to seek a meeting ground and a peaceful solution? What world are these folks living in? Certainly, not this one.

How in Heaven's name could Senator HENRY JACKSON stand up this past weekend and soberly propose as his great new idea to end the Vietnamese war that we simply make a deal to stop bombing the north in exchange for their stopping the sending of troops, etc., south?

Where has he been all these months? What does he think the situation is? What world is he living in?

We have just offered them much more than that for the same thing and it has accomplished what? Insults and new attacks.

This is shocking, irresponsible incompetence in the U.S. Senate, to so blandly ignore the facts of the situation as they already exist.

It would be more responsible to propose that we tear up our pledges, surrender the Vietnamese people up to slaughter and slavery, and abandon the policy of containing communism. We might as well notify India to quit resisting Red China; the Philippines and Thailand to forget their ties with us and make whatever accommodations they can with the Reds; Japan to forget any promises or pledges and completely review their attitudes toward Red expansion and cooperation; the Germans that our promises regarding Berlin are kaput, and they are on their own; the NATO countries, that our promises to Europe are just as good as our promises to South Vietnam—i.e., worthless; and tell Latin America to read the future without counting on us.

If it isn't worth it; let's face it, and let fall the burdens of world power, and toss our role in the ash can, and our system and power and freedom—and standard of living and former moral concepts, too.

Then, we can make our own accommodation to a world dominated by Communist economics and Communist social system (if they will let us), and see how we like it.

There are three alternatives: (1) we can violently resist; (2) we can systematically surrender; or (3) we can resist until they accept a "live and let live" coexistence.

The other "choices" offered seem to us to be imaginary, emotional, or subversive. They either imagine, against all the evidence, that the Communists are willing to make peace—or else they must argue that we can surrender South Vietnam but resist in other "better" places and still "hold the line."

But the whole argument and attitude of "buying peace" in Vietnam applies anywhere and everywhere * * * and once you start paying a blackmailer, he never stops. It is as true in the history of nations as in criminal history.

Do we resist as best we can? Do we pay the price? Is it worth it, terrible as it is? Or do we give up? Do we pay that price of peace? And is it worth it? That's the question, and we ought to quit fuzzing it up with phoney plans that have already been rejected by the Reds * * * and, above all, let us quit sabotaging the effort, if we are to make it at all, to resist effectively until the Reds decide to live and let live.

Meanwhile, loyalty isn't a one-way street, The fighting men are doing their fullest part for their commander in chief. He owes them a better deal than they got in this last "truce."

The Late Honorable Herbert Bonner

SPEECH

OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished predecessor in the House, the Honorable Carl T. Durham, has sent me a statement to place in the RECORD in the memory of his lifetime colleague and close personal friend, the late Honorable HERBERT COVINGTON BONNER.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to comply with Mr. Durham's request, particularly in view of his intimate association with Mr. Bonner in the House and his personal affection and regard for him. Mr. Durham's statement follows:

I wish to extend to Mrs. Bonner and the people of the First Congressional District of North Carolina my deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained in Herbert's passing. For more than 40 years Herbert and I were close friends, and I served with him in the Congress for more than 20 years. His personal popularity and the high esteem in which he was held extended throughout the House of Representatives and the Senate as well. During the many years in which he served the first district he gave to his constituents a dedicated service. He will now take his place in the history of our State of North Carolina as one of the great and effective men to serve in the U.S. Congress.

But the canvas of his achievements was not restricted to his district and State, for, as chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, he made significant and enduring contributions to our national maritime policy which will long be remembered.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Eva and the family in their great bereavement, which is shared by all who knew Herbert and his sterling worth to his district, State, and Nation.

Rabbits From the L.B.J. Hat?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Elkhart Truth, Elkhart, Ind., recently had excellent editorial comment on the President's state of the Union message. I am pleased to include it herewith:

[From the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth, Jan. 14, 1966]

RABBITS FROM THE L.B.J. HAT?

In his state of the Union message Wednesday evening, President Johnson concocted a formula to finance the expanded Vietnam war, carry on an extensive Great Society program, and still avoid inflation.

And if the President had pulled 27 rabbits from a hat in full view of his prime-time TV audience, the feat hardly could be considered more amazing.

The question is whether he really can pull all those political rabbits out of his big Texas hat.

Not without reason, skeptics are questioning that the budget deficit can be held anywhere near as small as L.B.J. envisions from his program.

If it can't a likely result is more inflation and higher prices.

And his idea of temporarily restoring auto and telephone excise tax cuts, which took effect January 1, is justly criticized, too.

The President wants to help people with small and moderate means, but such people also use phones and cars.

Besides, a main idea of the cuts was to stimulate sales, production, and jobs which in turn would mean more income and corporate taxes also needed to finance the Federal Government; to large extent raising the excise taxes again would be taking money from one pocket to put it in another.

As for inflation, the White House exerted quiet but heavy pressure against steel price hikes; but where was the White House pressure (even vocal) before the city of New York had to give in to the transit workers' court-defying strike, and allow a massive new benefit package? What will that do to the cost of living?

(Even if the White House couldn't do anything officially about the transit impasse, it might have expressed its moral judgment against defiance of the court).

L.B.J.'s idea of extending terms of House Members from 2 to 4 years has much to recommend it. True, a new House Member hardly learns the ropes before he has to go out and campaign again; and, for all House Members, campaign time comes around too often and this intrudes on regular business. It is also true that, coming at a time of a big Democratic majority, such a measure will tend to freeze Democrats into office longer.

We applaud the President for seeking legislation which will let the Government "effectively deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest"; for a coopertaive effort to make rivers clean; and for the creation of a new Cabinet-level Department of Transportation to pull together 35 present agencies thus involved.

As for the President's suggestion of stimulating trade with Communist Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R., we certainly wouldn't favor such policy in case of those countries now aiding the Vietcong, as Senator Dirksen says some are doing.

We approve of Mr. Johnson's determination that U.S. fighting men will stay in Vietnam as long as Red aggression continues; like him, we don't want the war to continue a moment longer than needed to halt such aggression.

But we're plainly skeptical of his everything-but-the-kitchen-sink fiscal policy.

Survey Says Negroes Lift White Area Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Record, I include the following:

SURVEY SAYS NEGROES LIFT WHITE AREA VALUE

A nationwide survey shows that prices of owner-occupied housing rise when Negroes move into white, inner-city neighborhoods.

"This should finally destroy—once and for all—the myth" that Negroes cause private housing prices to fall, Sherwood Ross, information and research director of the Washington Urban League, said yesterday in issuing the results of his survey. Ross made the study on his own initiative and not for the Urban League.

The survey was based on comparative market value and population statistics for 1950 and 1960 in U.S. Census tracts in 47 large cities.

Ross said that it is the first nationwide survey of privately owned and occupied houses in center cities. He added that his results were confirmed by three prior studies of individual cities and by a spot check system employed by the U.S. Census Bureau to verify its own census studies.

The survey was based on every measurable census tract, a total of 1,810, in 47 cities with populations of 100,000 or more.

It counted 1.3 million private inner-city homes of which 100,000 were nonwhite, mostly Negro. Ross excluded from his survey about 1,200 tracts which were mainly commercial, industrial, or had their boundaries so changed in 10 years that they could not be compared accurately.

The survey showed that while housing prices for predominantly white neighborhoods (85 percent white or more) increased about 35 percent in the 10 years, prices in predominantly Negro neighborhoods increased 61 percent.

But Ross pointed out that the average Negro inner-city home still remains much lower priced than the white inner-city home.

Changing neighborhoods—areas which lost about 10 percent of their white populations and gained Negro residents—showed a market-value increase of 42 percent.

Integrated neighborhoods—areas which remained racially stable over the 10-year census period—showed an increase of 45 percent in market value.

Ross pointed out that prices are skyrocketing in predominantly Negro neighborhoods because there is not enough good housing available and because the increasingly affluent Negro middle class is spending much of its income to improve existing housing.

Alabama Industry Leaders Warn of Danger in Proposal To Legalize Situs Picketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Congress will again be called upon to amend the Taft-Hartley Act, to permit secondary boycotts. Under pressure from labor lobbyists we are constantly deluged with propaganda designed to force favorable action on this amendment.

This week, members of the Alabama delegation in Congress heard another side of the story, presented at the annual Washington meeting of Associated Industries of Alabama. Mr. Luther W. Hallmon, personnel manager of O'Neal Steel, Inc., of Birmingham, made the report, and I include it here for the enlightenment of all the Members of Congress.

STATEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS FIELD, BEFORE THE ALABAMA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION, BY LUTHER W. HALLMON, PERSONNEL MANAGER, O'NEAL STEEL, INC., BIRMINGHAM, ALA., JANUARY 24, 1966.

Subject: Common situs and reserved gate picketing.

In discussing what effect an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, such as that proposed by the Industrial Union Department and the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO, would have on labor-management relations, it might be well to take a look at what we are really talking about. Let us take, for example, common situs or reserved gate picketing concerning a manufacturing plant which is being built at a cost of $60 million. As the plans to build the plant mature, a prime contractor is hired to build the plant. When the prime contractor receives the go-ahead to begin construction, there immediately becomes a need for subcontractors since very few—if any—prime contractors have the men and equipment to handle all aspects of such a job. Normally there will be a subcontractor engaged to clear the ground on which the plant is to be built. Next, excavation will be needed and normally another subcontractor becomes involved. Next, piling will have to be driven for the foundation of the building. This requires another subcontractor. Then different subcontractors will be used to lay the foundation, erect the building, install the piping, do the electrical work, install the tile, and install equipment of all descriptions; such as boilers, machines, et cetera. Subcontractors will be used to lay the railway track into the plant site and, in all, literally dozens of subcontractors and their hundreds of employees will be involved in the construction of this one plant.

Now, let us assume that the prime contractor and the union with which he has a labor agreement become involved in a dispute, and the union walks off the job and sets up a picket line. What happens? Immediately upon being notified that there is a picket line at the gate, all crafts walk off the job because of the old union theory: "I won't work behind a picket line." Now, what is the purpose of the picket line? Of course, the answer to this is quite simple. The object of the picket line is to bring pressure upon the prime contractor in order that the union will be able to get what it wants.

Naturally, pressure results from the picket line since the prime contractor wants his employees to work since he has a completion date with a penalty for not completing on time. He also has contracts with dozens of subcontractors who have jobs to complete at other sites and these jobs all have completion dates. A delay on this particular job or any of the other jobs would make it extremely hard to be at the right job at the right time in order that work continuity would be realized.

If the picketing shuts down the entire job instead of merely shutting down the portion being done by the employees of the prime contractor, then more pressure is brought to bear on the prime contractor. Now, the question arises: Is it more important to allow the picketing union to exert more pressure on the prime contractor, or is it more important to allow hundreds of employees of other subcontractors to continue to be able to feed their families?

Throughout the history of collective bargaining, unions have usually been successful in their attempts to negotiate a good contract for their members or to wrangle concessions from employers by simply striking the employees involved. It is unreasonable to assume that this success will not continue. In fact, the union has further safeguards to insure their success at the bargaining table. These safeguards were set out by the Supreme Court in the General Electric case. In this case the Court made it clear that in order for a union to be violating Taft-Hartley when picketing a reserved gate, the subcontractor's employees must not be engaged in work concerned with the day-to-day operation of the plant. This simply means that if the prime contractor used the employees of a subcontractor to perform work normally done by his employees, then the union has the right to picket the reserved gates.

When you look at the elements set out below which are encompassed by an ordinary strike, it certainly appears that the union has at least a 50–50 chance of success.

1. Ordinarily, it calls out the employees of the contractor or subcontractor having the dispute and suspends the functions they normally would perform.

2. If the strike is between an industrial plant and their union, it cuts off the struck firm's access to the market by stopping deliveries and pickups.

3. If the strike is between a union and a manufacturing plant, it prevents the employer from neutralizing the impact of the strike by using the cessation of operations as an occasion for performing certain work such as machinery overhaul which would normally require an interruption of activity.

4. If the strike is between a subcontractor and his union on a construction job where there are many subcontractors and a prime contractor, the strike will—if effective—keep the men (employees) of the struck employer out of the construction site; it will cause pressure to be brought by the prime contractor on the subcontractor because it is very important that the continuity of the work be kept up; it will cause pressure to be brought by the owner of the plant site on the prime contractor because of a completion date which will be held up should the strike last for a long period of time or even for a short period of time.

5. If there is not a reserved gate set aside for the employees of the particular subcontractor involved in the strike, then his employees can picket the main entrance to the construction site and close the entire job.

As you know, the differences between craft and industrial unions over common-situs picketing were supposedly smoothed over by an agreement reached in February 1965 between the Industrial Union Department and the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO. The two union groups agreed to support a Taft amendment on common-situs picketing that would apply to the construction industry only. It would permit building trades unions to picket a site in a dispute with a subcontractor even though the picketing caused employees of neutral contractors to stop work. Up until this agreement was consummated the industrial unions had demanded that any changes in the Taft Act picketing rules include protection for industrial union employees where a plant reserves a gate for use by employees of neutral construction firms.

If such an amendment passes, all of the expertise in handling such matters which the courts and boards have gained since the *Moore Drydock* case in 1950 (92 NLRB 547, 549) or the *Denver Building Trades* case of 1951 (315 U.S. 675, 678) will go down the drain, and the intent of Congress to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations will be completely nullified.

For the purpose of fully understanding what will be lost if the Taft-Hartley Act is amended as proposed by the AFL–CIO, one should know what the laws now say on this question. Set out below are excerpts from leading court and board decisions on this problem.

In the 1950 Moore Drydock case the NLRB set up standards for determining the legality of common-situs picketing. The standards are as follows:

Picketing must be limited to times when the primary (struck) employer's employees actually are present at the common site.

Picketing must be limited to places "reasonably close" to the operations of the primary employer's workers.

The pickets must show clearly that their dispute is with the primary employer alone.

The primary employer's workers must be engaged in the employer's normal business at the common site.

In the 1951 Denver Building Trades decision, the U.S. Supreme Court rejected the much-used union theory that the prime contractor and his subcontractors on a construction project are "allies" for the purpose of the secondary boycott prohibition. In applying the boycott provisions, the Court said the contractor and subcontractors must be treated as separate employees. This means that on construction sites, if one subcontractor is struck the other subcontractors and the prime contractor are neutral and not involved in the dispute.

In the 1961 General Electric decision the U.S. Supreme Court agreed with the Board in that where a union, in support of a dispute with an industrial company, pickets a gate reserved for the exclusive use of employees of neutral contractors, the picketing would appear to come within the secondary boycott provision of the Taft–Hartley Act. At the same time, the Court added this qualification: The employees of the contractors must be doing work that is "unrelated to the normal operations of the plant."

In order that one does not feel that the unions are being mistreated by the doctrines adopted by the courts and the Board, let us look at union rights in this matter.

1. A union may picket a reserved gate if the work being done by the employees using the gate is necessary to the normal operations of the plant—routine maintenance work, for example.

2. A union may picket a gate used by those making regular plant deliveries if the dispute involves the plant union.

3. A union may picket a common gate as long as there is no gate reserved for employees not involved in the dispute.

4. A union may, under many circumstances, picket two or more sites where employees of a contractor or subcontractor involved in a dispute with the union are working.

5. Unions may picket the premises of an employer who "is cooperating with a primary (struck) employer and * * * doing the work which he (the struck employer) is unable to do because of the strike."

6. Unions may picket in many instances other plants owned by the struck employer.

When arguing the rights of unions to involve neutral employees in a dispute between a union and a company which the union is picketing, the most important question to be answered is: Why should a union have this right? The answer is quite simple: It shouldn't.

Union attorneys argue that when you are picketing a jobsite where several crafts of the building trades unions are at work, you are picketing an integrated single operation or all subcontractors on the site are allies. A cursory glance at this argument shows the lack of depth it has. Even unions would hesitate to say that separate companies occupying plant sites in an industrial complex which happens to have a fence around it are allies or that they are one company. Yet, it may be that these plants come much closer to being allies than subcontractors on a construction site. For example, the manager of each plant in the industrial complex may meet monthly or otherwise to establish rules of operation in the complex. Plants may have to work very closely to coordinate rail shipping procedures since one set of railroad tracks serves all of the companies within the complex. The companies might lease warehouse space from the complex itself and storage problems would have to be worked out between the companies.

Now let us look at subcontractors at a new construction site. As a beginning we might consider the fact that in many instances the company having the work performed does not give the entire job to a prime contractor but reserves the right to let contracts to other contractors for various phases of the project. This means that in many instances subcontractors on a job will have no connection whatsoever with the so-called prime contractor or his subcontractors. The only connection such a subcontractor would have with the prime contractor would be that his employees work or want to work at the site where the prime contractor or one of his subcontractors is being picketed. Look at other possibilities. Let's say that the company having the plant built retained the right to have a company come in and photograph the job daily during the construction. A union having a dispute with the company taking the photographs could shut down the entire job each time a photographer appeared on the scene if the "ally" doctrine was followed by the courts and the board.

For this reason, we in the AIA oppose amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, as proposed in H.R. 10027.

American Parents Committee Lauds Republican Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, I joined with the distinguished ranking Republican and other minority members of the House Appropriations Committee in pointing out that President Johnson's $112.8 billion budget was a phony. Among other items, I pointed out that the cuts in the school lunch and milk programs were actually a fraud.

These are very popular programs and Congress will undoubtedly put these amounts back up to more realistic figures.

I am glad that the American Parents Committee, Inc., feels very much the way I do on this matter and has as a matter of fact, written to the President under date of January 18. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the full text of this letter to the President, written by Mrs. Barbara D. McGarry, executive director of the American Parents Committee, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

THE AMERICAN PARENTS
COMMITTEE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., January 18, 1966.

Re: Withholding of national children's milk program appropriations.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
Attention: Mr. Gardner Ackley.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American Parents Committee is distressed to learn that the Bureau of the Budget has decided to withhold $3 million of the funds already appropriated by the Congress for fiscal 1966 operations of the national children's milk program.

The American Parents Committee has consistently supported this vital ongoing program, with the conviction that it offers indisputable benefits to all our Nation's children. Both in schools and centers for underprivileged children, its success has been attested by an average 5-percent annual increases in participation.

To eliminate $3 million from present operating funds would mean denying the last 2 years' proven growth in this program. The U.S. Department of Agriculture has advised us that, with this cut in effect, all requests by participating schools will have to be 10 percent disallowed, as of February 1, 1966.

As a logical and beneficial means of allocating surplus whole milk, this program also reflects such sounder economic practice, than the Government's alternative of purchasing surplus milk at 75 percent of parity for price support, only to go to the additional expense of powdering and storage of the milk. In fiscal 1965, the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired $23 million of dried (powdered) milk, and suffered a subsequent loss of $13 million in sales.

The Bureau of the Budget would seen to have disregarded the expressed philosophy of the state of the Union message, which pledges that our children shall not be the victims of a false economy. Surely, in humanitarian as well as economic terms, our Nation's children represent our greatest national investment.

Respectfully,
MRS. BARBARA D. MCCARRY,
Executive Director.

A Christmas Package With Your Name on It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to recall briefly what it is like to observe Christmas at home in the United States. Then, for a moment, try to picture what Christmas would be like for our fighting men in Vietnam.

When Christmastime 1965, arrived in Vietnam, the 7,500 men fighting from Michigan who are there did not expect much. Imagine their reaction when they received Christmas gifts from the people of their home State, each gift individually addressed to a particular serviceman.

Operation Michigan Christmas is a wonderful true story. It ought to inspire other projects to let our fighting men know how much the folks back home really care.

The following article was printed in the January 23, 1966, edition of the Grand Rapids Press, a member of the Booth newspaper group, which launched and cosponsored this inspiring and unbelievably successful project:

The 7,500 Michigan men in Vietnam didn't expect much for Christmas last year.

War has a way of destroying expectations.

It took many hours of effort, contributions, and donations from an entire State to prove them wrong.

Called Operation Michigan Christmas, the project was more than a mere expression of forced concern; a duty that simply had to be done.

Rather, for the servicemen who were surprised to receive gift boxes of Michigan products, cards, and letters from individuals they had never heard of before, the special holiday effort was a testimonial of their State's genuine concern and respect.

It was a time for the fighting man to remember loved ones, families, and friends they had to leave when they put on the uniform of their country.

It was also a time to reassess and reaffirm their country's stand against an enemy they had learned to respect—and hate.

As one marine said:

"It made a fellow feel pretty good."

The idea for Operation Michigan Christmas came from the Lansing Bureau of Booth Newspapers, which publishes the Grand Rapids Press and eight other papers in Michigan.

It resulted in an appeal from Gov. George Romney last November for gift donations and servicemen's addresses.

The response was overwhelming.

Volunteers were called in from throughout the State to join hands in compiling the lists of names, sorting, packing, and labeling the mountain of gifts and contributions that arrived daily. Burroughs Corp., Detroit, coordinated much of this effort.

Booth Newspapers paid for flying the boxes from Willow Run Airport to Vietnam.

The Chirstmas boxes contained such items as soft drinks, aspirin, preserves, razor blades, gun oil, toothpaste, and other items donated or purchased from a fund of about $10,000 sent in by residents and organizations.

The servicemen have shown their appreciation in the only way a man can when he is far from home.

More than 2,000 letters of appreciation have been received by the Governor's office, most of them addressed to the people of Michigan.

They came from marines, soldiers, and sailors hailing from Muskegon to Detroit; Monroe to Ironwood; from cities and townships and rural routes in between—all over Michigan.

The gift boxes reached most of the men on Christmas Eve. They were delivered in combat zones, on ships and in hospitals.

Their impact was the same.

"I witnessed approximately 30 marines from my State receive their 'Michigan boxes,' " writes Lance Cpl. Daniel W. Bisher, Hillsdale.

"I saw an 18-year-old infantryman hide a tear that I am sure was shed for happiness.

"I saw several Michigan marines walking out of their unit post office with grins from ear to ear."

Capt. Sherwood J. Kok wrote this:

"You should have seen the happy smiles on the faces of the men from Michigan as they unpacked their gift boxes."

Some of the packages were never claimed. Bisher explained this:

"I saw one box that had no owner—he was dead."

Included in each package was a special 4-page paper prepared by Booth writers reporting the hometown situation at the holiday time.

The messages contained in the paper were enough to warm a December snow.

"When we opened the package," said Lt. John C. Andreoni, an Ohio native, and CWO Harold E. Stoelt, Wyandotte, "our men's eyes lit up like thousands of children back in the States.

"I read the greetings from the various cities and everybody quieted down and remained that way even after I finished.

"I saw a couple of tears, and the effect that reading had on our men was more powerful than any prayer ever written, or Christmas carol composed.

"It showed our men that people do care, and that fact alone made our Christmas so very, very happy."

Said Sgt. J. R. Henson:

"The stories printed by the different papers of Michigan made us feel and know that we weren't forgotten over here.

"I'm sure you won't mind if a little orphan boy received my box.

"The little plastic model car, the peanuts and rock candy made a wonderful Christmas gift for this little waif."

Not all the plans for generous sharing were accomplished.

We decided to give them (the presents) to the children at the orphanage in Qui Nhon. We were also going to put on a Christmas party for these 187 children who are very underprivileged," wrote Sp. 4c. Gerald A. Nagy of Warren.

"Yesterday, one of the sisters who takes care of these children received a letter from the Vietcong saying that if the GIs gave the children a Christmas party, they would bomb the orphanage.

"Our company immediately stopped all plans for the party, so now all we can do for these children is share our good fortune with them."

Some of the men made practical use of the gifts.

Sgt. Robert W. Dell is a tank commander in the 4th Cavalry, 1st Infantry Division. His driver is from Detroit.

Wrote Dell:

"I found many uses for some of the items on our tank. The lens tissues we can use to clean the lenses on our sights, since none of us wear glasses.

"The zipper ease will be good for our flak jackets if the zipper gets hard to close.

That there are those who care and understand proved a vital factor in the life of one soldier who sometimes is still puzzled about the nature of a war that has become so much a part of him.

Explained Pvt. Rank W. Barber:

"You can't imagine how much it helps us over here to know that the people back home really care."

For Ralph Johnston, Ann Arbor, the gift box meant the beginning of a friendship among his comrades in arms.

"I think the best part was that it made me aware of men in the area who are also from Michigan, and since then we have become good friends.

"For a friendship, sir, thank you is not enough."

The thoughts, prayers, and concern contained in each package renewed a sense of loyalty, dedication, and love for a State and its people.

The operation also enabled some to stand a little taller, walk a little prouder.

"I felt very proud as my fellow marines gathered around and commented that the package was addressed not to 'A Serviceman in Vietnam,' but to me personally, with name, rank, serial number, and complete address," boasted S. Sgt. Dale B. Cowan.

"My eyes grew misty and my throat tightened when I realize that the people of Michigan had sent this very warm and pleasant greeting as a personal way of saying that they are behind me and my fellow servicemen in Vietnam."

Others kept the empty boxes as mementos.

"I'm proud to leave the empty box sitting by my rack with those big letters facing out so the guys can read 'Season's Greetings from the People of Michigan.'

"Thanks, thank you so very much Michigan," wrote Lance Cpl. Thomas J. Roehrig.

Another letter, from James N. Bogema, Kalamazoo, says:

"I am proud I was born, educated, and served my State as well as my Nation. I pray that the wonderful State of Michigan will always have such wonderful and understanding people."

One future college student volunteered his services for next Christmas.

"I am returning in January and will begin college at Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti. If this war is still going on next year, you can count on me to lend a helping hand for another Michigan Christmas in Vietnam," promised Sgt. Thomas B. Dawson.

There were feelings of disgust and shame voiced about those students who protest against U.S. involvement in Vietnam.

The consensus is that a brief exposure to the actuality and purpose of the struggle against communism in a once defenseless land would change a few opinions.

There is a realization, however, that not all students make a sport of draft card burning.

"I have a funny hunch that some of those college kids who got unfavorable publicity had a lot to do with making this Operation Christmas in Vietnam possible," said Michael E. Cimoli, a helicopter crew chief.

It makes it a little easier to know that someone understands.

From Capt. Charles E. Tennant, a helicopter pilot:

"We realize that only a small percentage of Americans are against our presence in Vietnam, but at the same time, it is comforting and reassuring to receive this concrete example of the moral support of the folks back home."

The cards and letters in each package written with the innocence possessed only by small children brought tears to the eyes of grown men, and made them remember.

"The letter in the box from the little girl made a couple of tears come to my eyes. I have six kids of my own," wrote S. Sgt. Jack Grundy.

One youngster had orders for S. Sgt. Richard Hurlbut:

"To the sergeant * * * Dear Sarge—do not boss around too much—do not be too mean.

"Merry Christmas."

Hurlbut replied, "All sergeants are not mean * * * and really, we try not to 'boss around' too much. But thank you for being concerned with the welfare of your soldiers."

It isn't difficult to think of children in Vietnam. The letters made it clear their half starved, war mangled and many times diseased bodies and dirt-streaked faces are everywhere.

Many of the men felt a need to share their unexpected good fortune with these children.

"I assure you that everything will be put to good use. What I can't use myself will be contributed to the Tan Mai Orphanage," one letter, signed by four privates and a specialist fourth class said.

Cpl. Donald Barbee, Kalamazoo, had this to say:

"I want to thank * * * the people of Michigan for the Christmas gift. It was the nicest gift I could have gotten—next to being sent home to my wife and three little angels."

Some of the presents were just not practical.

Wrote a marine: "My buddy gave me his razor blades, he doesn't shave yet."

For youths aged by battle and the veteran who has fought in two World Wars and Korea, it indeed was a memorable Christmas.

Their jobs were diversified, from infantryman to file clerk, but their sentiments were the same.

Several made apologies for their spelling, the inability to properly express what they felt, the time it might take for a busy man like a Governor to read their letters.

They did not make apologies for the job they were doing and the job they will continue to do.

They were, and still are, determined to come home a winner.

Sp5c. Floyd Rozewski summed it up:

"We all hope that you back home will think of us not only during these holidays, but for the duration of this war.

"For we will always need your support."

If Troops Need Handguns, Let United States Provide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in a recent issue of one of our newspapers, the Buffalo Courier Express, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the use of handarms by our troops in Vietnam. I wholeheartedly support the views expressed in the editorial and have introduced legislation in this respect.

IF TROOPS NEED HANDGUNS, LET UNITED STATES PROVIDE

It is the responsibility of the U.S. Government to provide its servicemen with the best possible equipment—both as to type and to quality. Their lives and their effectiveness depend upon the weapons with which they are equipped. The Defense Department should be alert to combat conditions which indicate the need for special equipment.

A case in point is a dispatch from Denver to the effect that a young marine private first class in Vietnam had written his family asking them to send him a pistol for use against the Vietcong. He said his issued weapon, a rifle, was not suited to the job of flushing guerrillas out of caves and other fortifications. He said many of his buddies were also requesting and receiving pistols from their families. His father sent him a regulation .45 automatic.

The suggestion here is that if handguns are proving effective in jungle and fortress-area warfare and are desired by the troops doing the fighting, then it is the Government, not the families, which should be doing the supplying.

Associated Industries of Alabama State Position on H.R. 1153

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Record I would like to include the third in a series of reports made to members of the Alabama delegation by the delegates to the annual Washington meeting of Associated Industries of Alabama. This report states the position of the association on H.R. 1153, labor-management program. It was submitted by Mr. James B. Brand, director of industrial relations, James B. Clow & Sons, Inc., Birmingham:

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROGRAM—H.R. 1153

(Statement in the industrial relations field presented before the Alabama congressional delegation by James B. Brand, director of industrial relations, James B. Clow & Sons, Inc., Birmingham, Ala., January 24, 1966)

On August 10, 1965, the House passed by voice vote and sent to the Senate an amended bill H.R. 1153—labor-management program. The bill would amend the Taft-Hartley Act to permit employer contributions for jointly administered product promotion programs or committees for the interpretation of collective bargaining agreements.

Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act prohibited, with certain exceptions, payments by employers to employee representatives. The purpose of the restriction was to prevent corrupt practices, such as bribery or extortion.

This bill would legalize jointly administered product promotion programs and committees for the interpretations of collective bargaining agreements by adding them to the list of exceptions.

AIA is of the opinion that if this bill is passed as written, it will simply grant a union "veto power over the public relations programs of the company with respect to the promotion of its products."

Although the bill states that the joint programs are not a mandatory subject of collective bargaining, you know, as we do, the unions have ways of making sure these things are negotiated into the contract.

For these reasons, we feel that H.R. 1153 is not in the best interest of sound labor-management practices and should not be enacted.

The First Day of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, we all realize the importance of the Magna Carta, not only to the English, but to ourselves and freemen everywhere. The December 1965–January 1966 issue of Kiwanis magazine carries an article by J. A. Maxtone Graham entitled "The First Day of Democracy." It is an interesting account of what the Magna Carta does and does not do, and I include it herewith:

THE FIRST DAY OF DEMOCRACY

(By J. A. Maxtone Graham)

Neither side was in the best of tempers—the one, because of the long and evasive delays engineered by the other; the other, because of the feeling that the rights of their principal, rights that had stood unchallenged for centuries, were being removed by threat of force. At the daily meetings on the long green meadow beside the Thames, in gay tents and pavilions, there was little good will. Both sides were constantly on guard for treachery. Few strayed from the open field toward the wooded hill that overlooked the river for fear of ambush. In the evenings, when the barons and their followers retired to their encampment at Staines, King John and his men would ride back to the safety of the thick walls of Windsor Castle, where they would confer far into the night on how these monstrous, unjustifiable demands could be answered.

At length, after endless discussion in the upper class language of the day, which was still Norman French, and with as much acerbity and lack of understanding as would now be felt between labor and management in a big contract dispute, terms were drafted that, as a compromise, completely satisfied neither party, yet would allow the business of the country to continue. On Monday, June 15, 1215, before a gathering of several thousand people, King John, a sly-looking, bearded man of 48 who stood only 5 feet, 5 inches high, gave assent for the final draft to be sealed, for he himself was unable to write.

No one at Runnymede that day would have been anything but surprised had he the foreknowledge that in 750 years' time the Magna Carta (called "the Great" only to distinguish it from a minor one dealing with forests) would be the subject of worldwide celebration and scholarly analysis. Written in 54 lines of medieval Latin on a 12- by 26-inch piece of parchment, the deed's main purposes were local and temporary, to correct certain abuses that had grown up during the reign of John and his predecessors, and that were in danger of becoming customary. For convenience, later historians divided the 1 continuous paragraph into 63 clauses, only 12 of which are still valid today, and only a few of any modern importance:

"1. The English Church shall be free, and shall have its rights undiminished, and its liberties unimpaired.

"9. A debtor's land shall not be seized while he has movable goods to discharge the debt.

"20. A man shall be fined only in proportion to the degree of his offense, but not so heavily as to deprive him of his livelihood.

"39. No freeman shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way; nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land."

These four are typical of the best and most lasting of the clauses; yet to the barons who drafted the Magna Carta it was the correction of specific royal abuses that mattered most. The King's officials had acquired the habit of requisitioning food, fuel, and transport of their travels, and of moving on either without paying or with the promise, seldom kept, to pay later. The administrtaion of the law had fallen on slack times; there had been no eyre (itinerant court) in circulation for 6 years, and people had no redress against the wrongdoings of tyrannical local officials. Taxation, in the form of "scutage" of "shield money" paid in place of military service, had reached a new high. Justices and sheriffs, in many cases people who had little knowledge of or care for the law, were discharging their duties brutally and dishonestly. The King had seized hostages from the families of mutinous nobles as a surety for good behavior, and most of John's soldiers were unruly, scoundrelly mercenaries whom he had brought in from abroad to protect him, and whom he rewarded with civil service posts and high offices.

For 2 years a band of barons had been fulminating against John's abuse of his power. Each time the King promised that he would behave better in the future; each time he made no effort to do so. In the meantime the Pope in 1213 had appointed Stephen Langton Archbishop of Canterbury, for England was still a Roman Catholic country. Langton, 62, a scholar, poet, and man of great patience and wisdom, was appalled at the straits into which his country had fallen after 20 years of maladministration. He took several of the angry barons aside and showed them the wording of a vague charter of rights drawn up more than a hundred years before by Henry I. He convinced them that the only hope they—and the country—had was to produce a new written charter that the King would accept. After busy scribes had covered many sheets of parchment with tentative clauses in draft after draft, a document, called the "Articles of the Barons," was finished.

The barons and their men then marched south, to London. When the gates of the city were eagerly thrown open to them (for the cities and boroughs, a growing force in what had been a predominantly rural nation, were among the most abused sections of the country), John realized that he no longer controlled the balance of power. He agreed to meet his opponents at Runnymede, and formally sealed the articles of the barons as a basis for further discussion.

Under the articles, all the wrongs caused by John's evildoing would be righted; services to the Crown would be paid for immediately; two justices would visit each county four times a year; scutage would not be levied without the consent of a committee of nobles; only people who knew the law would administer it; all hostages would be given up; the unpopular mercenaries would be deprived of office and sent home; and the barons would choose 25 of their number to be guardians of the terms of the charter.

These terms might at first seem a massive blow for the people against the State; yet an examination of the clauses shows that the principal beneficiaries were to be the earls and barons, their families, and the higher ranking of the many underlings who, in the day of the feudal system, depended on them. The few clauses benefiting the common people, the townsfolk, or the church were craftily inserted by the barons (led by Robert Fitzwalter, who was no less unscrupulous than the King) to attract more support for their movement. Even the apparently altruistic stipulation that men were not to be deprived of the tools of their trade in lieu of payment of debt had a back-handed purpose, for a landlord too would suffer if his villeins had no plows with which to work his soil.

A serf guiding a set of harrows through the black fens of Lincolnshire was as little affected by the events at Runnymede as would an Australian aboriginal by a meeting of the United Nations. Nor was his way of life greatly altered when in the following autumn the Pope ordered John to cancel the charter as illegal and excommunicated the barons who had been behind it. (Archbishop Langton refused to publish the excommunication, and had to relinquish his post.)

It was not a time for easy communication of ideas. The 3 million inhabitants of England led quiet, isolated lives. Perhaps a hundred thousand or two dwelled in London and the larger towns; the remainder, unless well enough born to inhabit keep or castle, lived purely rural existences in villages of 200 or 300 people. Accurate news was hard to come by; only the rich traveled. The villager's life was the village, except perhaps for occasional excursions along rutted roads to a fair or market a few miles distant.

A man who was wronged by his neighbor or by the state would find it hard to get redress; local officials were elected by nepotism and robed in graft. The villein was little better off than a slave, owning no property, receiving no wages, and faced with the choice either of working properly for his lord or starving. He was tied to the land where he lived, and could be bought and sold with the property. If his daughter married onto another property, he was fined by the landlord for the loss of the labor of her and her children.

A freeman fared somewhat better. He could practice as a craftsman or a small tradesman, but still was liable for considerable dues and services to his superior. Above him was an esquire or a knight who could exact services from his inferiors, but who, in turn, owed allegiance—and liability for military service—to his overlord, the baron. It was the responsibility of these men to supply armed forces to the Crown (the numbers and conditions were known by long custom, and had been the conditions under which land grants were made by William the Conqueror and his successors), though there was an arrangement whereby, at the King's discretion, they could pay scutage instead of sending men. The recognized maximum for the infrequent emergency demands for scutage in the two previous reigns had been 2 marks per soldier, enough money to buy nearly a ton and a half of wheat, worth $100 today.

Terribly spoiled by his parents as the youngest of eight children, John grew up to disregard all convention. Insolent, moody, unpredictable, lecherous, totally unable to accept advice, yet bringing disaster after disaster upon himself by his own actions, immediately greedy for anything he desired, and liable to Hitlerian tantrums of ungovernable rage, when he would roll on the floor and gnaw the rush mattings, John bore all the marks of the psychopath. He made no effort to conform to the unwritten agreements of the past, and began exacting scutage every year, as well as personal service.

In 1210 he demanded scutage twice for his wars in Wales and Scotland, to the tune of 3½ marks. Four years later he demanded another 3. This was equivalent to asking a $10,000-a-year man today for an extra $1,000 in income tax. It was crippling to the barons, especially to those in England's poorer northeast country who had already been in debt when John took the throne.

The two kings before John had been his father and brother, Henry II and Richard I. Henry was a wise, excellent administrator, and can be numbered among the very best English monarchs. His son Richard, known as "the Lionheart," is remembered as a hero, a great crusader, and an upholder of Christianity, of right, and, therefore, of England. The truth is less kind, however. Richard was basically a sportsman, and it was as a particularly pleasing form of bloodsport that he regarded the crusades. In the 10 years that he was theoretically ruling England, he was so busy directing the slaughter of the insolent Saracens that he spent no more than 6 months in the country of his throne.

It is hardly surprising that such absenteeism in the days when the King's power was indeed absolute, and when there was little in the way of an executive government to make policies and decisions in his behalf, should lead to a considerable slide in the affairs of state, and it is only fair to King John to explain that he inherited a daunting amount of inefficiency and crisis when he unexpectedly ascended the throne in 1199 at the age of 33—unexpectedly, because Richard has nominated his nephew Arthur to succeed him, and only on his deathbed did he change his mind. (Just to be on the safe side, John then murdered Arthur.)

England was not the only territory John had to be concerned with. There was the unruly populace of Ireland to be held in check. The jealous, patriotic, warlike peoples of Scotland and Wales were sources of constant trouble. In addition, the English kingdom stretched across the Channel, through half of France, and all the way to the Pyrenees on the Spanish border. Normandy, Brittany, Aquitaine, Anjou, Maine, Gascony, Poitou, and the Channel Islands were all, reluctantly, under the English sway. And as the French grew more and more restless in their demands for freedom, more and more soldiers were needed to put down local rebellions.

By means of his colossal taxation John raised army after army; but he conducted his campaigns with less than his brother's boldness and efficiency. John Lackland, as he was called in his youth, was the only one in the family with no property of his own; now it was John Soft-sword who was losing one battle after another, so that by 1205 he had nothing left in France except the Channel Islands, Poitou, and Aquitaine. Once again John returned to England, determined to equip himself so that he could win his property back. It was now that he made the excessive demands that led to the Magna Carta.

There was no foundation in law for the Articles of the Barons except for the fact that John had guaranteed to observe certain specific freedoms during his reign. It was no more possible to enforce these than it would be to hold a Senator or Congressman to his election promises. Subsequent efforts on the part of scholars and jurists to regard them as the basis for a British Constitution are quite without foundation. "Magna Carta was the product not of a rebellion," wrote Historian Arthur Bryant, "but of a revolution carried out by the process of law."

It is a common misconception that habeas corpus, that complete British and American safeguard against wrongful detention, originated at Runnymede, when in fact the Habeas Corpus Act was not passed until 1679. Nor was trial by jury part of the charter; its origins lay in reforms during the previous century to replace trial by ordeal, in which a suspected felon could prove his innocence by remaining unharmed after grasping a red-hot iron, being plunged into icy water, or some other such ordeal. There was no mention of any kind of parliament, unless one counts the baronial committee of 25. It fell to Simon de Montfort to father the first Parliament 50 years later, in 1265.

In later centuries, by the setting of precedent after precedent, and as representatives from the counties and then from the boroughs were summoned to Westminster to help with the business of government, the modern principles of universal suffrage and universal representation gradually emerged to become the democratic system enjoyed today on both sides of the Atlantic. The growth of popular elections to choose representatives was a slow and gradual process that did not finish until 1920, when American women got the vote, and 1928, when the British suffragettes got their way.

Nevertheless, the importance of the Magna Carta must not be underrated. When, in 1776, the colony of Virginia found itself chafing under the yoke of another needy and greedy tryant, George III, one of the most important and basic clauses of its bill of rights was that "no man be deprived of his liberty except by the law of the land or the judgment of his peers"—almost a repetition of clause 39 of the 13th century charter. And when the State of Massachusetts, in 1780, drafted her own bill of rights, section XI was no more than a mere echo of the Magna Carta: "Every subject * * * ought to obtain right and justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it; completely, and without denial; promptly, and without delay, conformably to the laws." For brevity, clause 40 of the 1215 charter is to be preferred: "To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice." A careful reading of the Constitution and its amendments will uncover other reminders of Runnymede: that private property should not be taken for public use without just compensation; that a trial must be held in the State where the crime was committed.

(By a curious freak of fate, one of the four surviving copies of the original charter was on exhibition at the 1939 New York World's Fair. When war broke out in September, the British Government, afraid to risk its passage across the Atlantic, had the ancient parchment placed for the duration under perpetual guard in the Library of Congress, alongside the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.)

But these are merely trivial instances of the general principles embodied in the charter. What is important is not so much the wording of the document, but that it came into being at all. After John died in 1216, king after king, throughout the Middle Ages, readily confirmed on his accession that he would honor its conditions. For the first time in the history of the nation, despotism gave way to the idea that others in the kingdom should have a say in the way it was run. Moreover, the terms were actually incorporated in the statute rolls of England. Seven hundred years later, the jurist and historian Lord Bryce wrote about the Magna Carta: "It was the starting point of the constitutional history of the English race, the first link in a long chain of constitutional instruments which have moulded men's minds and held together free governments, not only in England but wherever the English race has gone and the English tongue is spoken."

The charter by no means defined democracy as we know it today; there was no question of any but a clique of the highest born contributing to the government of the land. It was as if Britain today were ruled by the Queen in consultation with the House of Lords. For many, many years after the tense and inimical doings at Runnymede, most people in England would live, marry, and die in wretchedness, without even the slightest chance of electing anyone to represent their interests.

The Magna Carta, then, might seem an inadequate basis from which to evolve a modern life of individual freedom for 300 million English-speaking people, but it was a useful start.

Katzenbach Opens New Vote Drive in South—Promises U.S. Help if Whites Try To Coerce, Frighten Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Record the following report, by Simeon Booker, of Jet magazine, concerning Attorney General Katzenbach's visit to Alabama, opening a new vote drive in the South:

KATZENBACH OPENS NEW VOTE DRIVE IN SOUTH—PROMISES U.S. HELP IF WHITES TRY TO COERCE, FRIGHTEN NEGROES

(By Simeon Booker, Jet Washington bureau chief)

Negro civil rights officialdom described him as "timid and cautious." Southern lawmakers harangued him as "bold and aggressive." The daily press mirrored him as "colorless and drab."

Against this backdrop of conflicting impressions, U.S. Attorney General Nicholas deBelleville Katzenbach undertook an unprecedented civil rights mission. He flew into the deep South and stars, along with meteorites, fell all over Alabama.

Recognized as the Cabinet member with the controversial task of smashing barriers to Negro voting, Katzenbach selected the seaport city of Mobile, Ala., for an adventurous crusade. He appeared at a Negro vote rally to state the Government's position, to encourage Negroes to flock to the polls and finally to urge moderate whites to join in the democratization of one of the country's race relations wastelands.

Few Cabinet members would dare visit a Dixie town and address a Negro audience, fearful of antagonizing the Southern lawmaking powerhouse on Capitol Hill. Few VIP's would be courageous enough to speak their minds in the South on firm implementation of the civil rights laws. Most would concoct fanciful statements from huge Washington offices and sit back and count the press clippings.

When leaders of three civil organizations (Nonpartisan Voters League., Mobile County Coordinating Committee, and the Mobile County Movement) singled out Katzenbach as their main speaker for the 103d anniversary Emancipation Day celebration, none had any idea he would accept the invitation. It was a process of thinking big, and it paid off when the Attorney General replied that he was "pleased with the idea." "Don't embarrass the Attorney General" became the cry as a flood of leaflets, fliers, and cards circulated in Mobile as well as areas in two surrounding States.

"We couldn't afford to have this man speak to an empty hall," said C. H. Montgomery, a voter-registration chairman. "We knew our opponents would laugh at us."

In past years the emancipation program was held at a Negro church and 500 filled the seats. The 1966 affair loomed as the giant in the municipal auditorium with a 10,000-person capacity. The prospects of seeing a U.S. Attorney General in the flesh proved to be a tremendous attraction as 4,500 arose and applauded when the former Air Force navigator, who was shot down over Europe and captured by the Germans, was introduced.

As the symbol of U.S. might in civil rights, Katzenbach, in a calm, unruffled style, detailed President Johnson's plan to unlock the voting rights, reaffirming his determination to add more voter registrars. He warned against any "slow down tactics," promising that "any qualified Negro who wants to register to vote will be registered." He called for longer hours of registrars and announced that he was sending shortly letters to 518 registrars spelling out the Government's program.

Heavy applause erupted when he said, "I have a message for those noisy few who may entertain thoughts of trying to frighten or coerce a Negro citizen—or any citizen—from trying to register to vote. If you do, you will have the Federal Government to reckon with."

Katzenbach was forced to pause 23 times during his speech for outbreaks of applause.

He was greeted warmly and affectionately even as the State's Negro leadership called for broader Justice Department action. A farmer had wet eyes as the Attorney General ended his speech on this note: "A century ago, it was Lincoln who emancipated the Negro. A generation hence, we may very well recognize that it was the Negro who helped emancipate the Nation." At the close of his 29-minute talk, the Alabama Negroes, plus a sprinkling of whites, stood frenzied, clapping hands and shouting.

During the 2-day visit to Alabama, the Attorney General conferred with Federal authorities, attorneys, and integrated gatherings. There were always the reminders that he was in the Deep South. The daily newspaper refused to publish Negroes in pictures with the Attorney General (despite the historic occasion) and a local bar association which invited him to speak, discourteously allowed a presiding officer to criticize Katzenbach during an introduction. The official charged that the Attorney General provoked "race riots" because of his visits. There was little doubt that the trip stimulated Negro voting which was a purpose of the mission. Katzenbach was winning a new image.

The State of Controlled Thermonuclear Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House GOP conference committee on nuclear affairs, I am issuing a summary of the present state of controlled thermonuclear research to members of the conference which also may be of interest to others. The document also contains recommendations for improving U.S. efforts in this area and is reproduced below:

CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR FUSION—STATUS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

During two decades since the blasting birth of the Atomic Age at Hiroshima in 1945, man has made great progress harnessing the uranium atom for peaceful production of electricity. But while controlling and converting the power of the A-bomb to peaceful use has become reality, converting the H-bomb to peaceful use by controlling the release of its even greater energy to produce heat for generating electricity remains in the dream stage. In 1945 this accomplishment was predicted to be 20 years into the future. Today the prediction is still 20 years.

It has been estimated that the boundless reserve of hydrogen in the oceans of the globe—if it can ever be brought to man's disposal—will provide his energy requirements to infinity.

Uranium and plutonium atoms release their energy by fission—the process of breaking down into lighter elements. The weight lost converts into energy as predicted by Einstein's equation: Etmc^2. In contrast, hydrogen atoms release their energy by fusion—the process of combining, or fusing, together to form a larger atom, helium. The weight, or mass, converted to energy in the fusion process is greater than that involved in the fission process.

The resultant energy E, is considerably greater because c^2—the factor in the formula by which mass, m, is multiplied to calculate E—is a very large number. It is the speed of light—around 186,000 miles per second—times itself.

In addition to the advantage of drawing on a practically limitless fuel supply, controlled thermonuclear reactors possess at least two other substantial advantages: (1) They will not produce large quantities of radioactive waste as do existing reactors. (2) Their product is less easily diverted to weapons use.

The vast difficulty with controlling the process of thermonuclear fusion is that temperatures similar to that of the sun are needed to fuse hydrogen atoms together. Such temperatures can be achieved momentarily in an H-bomb. But achieving them indefinitely in a peaceful power producing reactor is quite another matter. At such temperatures the hydrogen atoms become what is known as a plasma. The plasma is exceedingly unstable and hard to control. Its gyrations spread out, temperature is lost, and the fusion process stops.

No physical materials will stand up under the sun-like temperatures involved, and none can be used to confine the gyrations and instabilities of the plasma. Instead, scientists have been attempting to do it by the use of very strong magnetic forces which are impervious to heat. Our knowledge of these forces—and perhaps others which might be employed similarly—is still rudimentary. The principal effort of scientists engaged in thermonuclear research is aimed at learning how to employ such forces to stabilize plasma.

Once that is accomplished they will face the less complex, but nevertheless difficult, problem of devising a means to transform the heat released into useable electricity. This will involve using it to make steam to turn turbo-electric generators or the development of thermionic and thermoelectric devices which transform heat directly to electricity by generating a steady stream of electrons to feed into the transmission lines bringing electricity to our homes and factories.

In the United States the Atomic Energy Commission supports controlled thermonuclear research at a level of about $21 million per year—about one-fifth the total world effort. The AEC believes that even though our expenditure is this fraction, the effective work we do amounts to about one-third the world's total. The other countries involved in this research are West Germany, France, Great Britain, and the U.S.S.R. During the past 4 years these countries have been expanding their work rapidly with new devices, new facilities and vigorous, youthful staffmen.

During the same period the U.S. budget has been static and largely inflexible. Unless the United States is to be overtaken and become second to other nations in this field, our expenditures must increase. We need to attract talented young scientists and engineers into it. The AEC's Ad Hoc Review Committee on U.S. Controlled Nuclear Fusion Programs, chaired by Prof. Raymond G. Herb of the University of Wisconsin, recommends at least doubling the numbers of scientists and engineers over the next 5 years. This projects, in budgetary terms, to an annual spending level considerably in excess of $100 million.

The AEC now carries on controlled thermonuclear research at four major laboratories: Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, and Lawrence Radiation Laboratory in California.

Programs also are being carried on without AEC support at the Naval Research Laboratory, at General Atomics Corp., at General Electric Corp., and at Aerojet General-Nucleonics Corp.

In addition to increasing the size of the U.S. effort, we should take immediate steps toward establishing a definite national center for plasma studies and controlled nuclear fusion research. The new center should have broadly based research programs with close ties to one or more universities so that it may play an important role in the teaching and preparation of students for careers in thermonuclear research. The Ad Hoc Review Committee concurs in this view.

Asia Awakening to China Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal in its lead article of the editorial section for Sunday, January 16, 1966, carried the following account by our distinguished colleague, Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, knowledgeable and dynamic chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Congressman ZABLOCKI led a group of nine Congressmen on a recent 35-day study mission to 15 countries on the periphery of Communist China. I am sure his observations of conditions in that explosive area of the world are of interest to my colleagues, and I submit them for the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House and others.

ASIA AWAKENING TO CHINA THREAT

(By Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI)

To the eye of the American observer, the Far East often seems a kaleidoscope of chaotic and often puzzling patterns. It is all too easy, in such a situation, to retreat into stereotypes about what the Asians want and what they think about certain world issues. Such generalizations can be dangerous because they cause us to lose sight of the important racial, cultural, religious and political differences which exist among nations in the Far East.

A Tokyo workingman, for example, might have much more in common with a Milwaukee worker than with his counterpart in Thailand. The goal of our congressional study mission was to see things for ourselves. Of course, 5 weeks is insufficient time to conduct indepth surveys of every nation in Asia. It is long enough, however, to visit certain key countries and to benefit from the wisdom of top Asian statesmen and U.S. officials stationed in the area. This is what our delegation attempted to accomplish.

The dominant impression left with me by the trip is the increasing recognition in Asia of the dangers to peace and stability posed by Communist China. It is clear to most non-Communist Asians that the Peiping regime is determined to make all of Asia its sphere of influence.

In Thailand, Korea, Japan, India, and Taiwan, the realization is growing that the Chinese are a constant grave threat; that South Vietnam, as serious a situation as it is, constitutes only the current target for Communist expansionism in Asia, and that, if the Peiping-inspired efforts are successful in Vietnam, other countries soon will be under similar siege.

SHASTRI WAS WORRIED

The Thai Foreign Minister, Thanat Khoman, for example, informed us that infiltration of North Vietnamese into remote areas of northeast Thailand has been confirmed. A Thai "national liberation front" currently is in China waiting for an opportunity to begin widespread guerrilla action in Thailand, which has been a stanch friend of the West.

In our conversations with the late Prime Minister Shastri, that Indian leader voiced great concern about a recent Chinese military buildup on the northern borders. There is a grave danger that the Chinese may soon attempt to move into Sikkim, a small protectorate of India in the Himalayas.

("It is indeed tragic," Representative ZABLOCKI said last week after Shastri's death in Tashkent, "that in this time of strained world relations this great Asian leader should be taken from our ranks. In our recent meeting I found the Prime Minister dedicated to the welfare of the Indian people and the cause of world peace.")

In view of the Chinese threat, many Asian nations are taking steps to defend themselves against Communist aggression and subversion. The Indians are strengthening defenses along their northern borders. The Thai are sending increased numbers of police forces into their northeastern provinces, where they are most vulnerable to infiltration. The Nationalist Chinese on Taiwan have done an almost incredible job of creating a bulwark of strength against communism, with U.S. aid.

It was my good fortune to be able to visit Kinmen (Quemoy), the Nationalist-held island several miles off the Red China shore. Once simply a rocky peak jutting from the Pacific Ocean floor, the island today is a fortress of strength and a thorn in the side of the Peiping regime.

Only in Japan did we find a reluctance to arm against China. The antimilitary reaction to World War II still is strong. But the attitude of the Japanese toward taking a more dynamic, positive role in Asian affairs seems to be improving. We are given assurances at the highest levels that Japan will increase its economic assistance to the less developed nations of Asia during the coming years. Japan is expected to play a major role in the founding of the Asian Development Bank for financing long-term economic development.

ONLY UNITED STATES CURBS CHINA

The military and economic efforts of the free Asian countries cannot by themselves withstand the pressure from Red China. Without U.S. assistance, it is clear, these countries soon would fall under Communist domination. Only the United States stands between China and its goal of utter supremacy in Asia. That is why the Communists are so shrill in their demands that we withdraw from Vietnam and our other positions in Asia.

This was recognized by the Asian leaders to whom we spoke. None of them, it should be noted, believed the United States had "neocolonialist" ambitions or was any threat to their sovereignty. Most, in fact, would welcome increased American commitments.

It was disheartening, indeed, that the only persons from whom we heard "Get out of Vietnam" were Americans. These were the U.S. students who picketed our delegation outside the American Embassy in New Delhi. It is unfortunate that their learning experience in India did not dispel their ignorance over the strategic designs of Communist China.

Much of the instability in Asia, of course, is caused by the animosities between non-Communist nations. The prime example, of course, is the bitterness between India and Pakistan over Jammu-Kashmir. Our visit to both countries has convinced me that further conflict by these neighbors in south Asia would seriously harm their economies—to the benefit of Red China. Already both countries have been forced to divert funds to military uses which are desperately needed for economic development.

HEARTENING SIGNS

Yet despite the recent conflict, India and Pakistan have continued to cooperate on the huge Indus River Basin project which will conserve and eventually bring precious water to irrigate their farmlands. The need for water is being felt most keenly because south Asia experienced its most severe drought in a century last year, and widespread famine may result. It is vital that India and Pakistan somehow resolve their differences and get on with the job of making a better life for their people.

Our mission observed heartening evidence that longstanding grievances between Asian nations can be solved to the benefit of all.

We landed in Tokyo on the historic night when the Japanese Diet ratified the treaty restoring normal relations with South Korea. This pact will make possible fruitful cooperation between those countries. The United States has encouraged this action by two of our allies as a move which strengthens anti-Communist ties in the Far East.

Another example of regional cooperation is the Mekong River development project in which Thailand, Laos, South Vietnam, and even Cambodia are participating.

Still another example of Asian cooperation in the cause of freedom has been the contributions of Asian nations to the Vietnam war.

The South Koreans have provided an entire division for combat duty against the Vietcong and are proud of the distinguished service which their fighting forces have rendered.

Chiang Kai-shek—who is aging, but is still as alert as ever—was proud of the technical assistance which his government is giving to South Vietnam.

In the Philippines, we were assured by the new President, Ferdinand Marcos, and members of his government that the Philippine Legislature will soon take up the question of sending combat troops to Vietnam.

In Vietnam itself, it is evident that real progress has been made on the military front by the addition of U.S. combat troops to the Vietnamese fighting forces. Our soldiers have demonstrated their ability to cope with the type of hit and run guerrilla warfare at which the Vietcong are so adept. There is good evidence that the morale of the Communist guerrillas is sagging. At the same time, however, the increased infiltration of regular North Vietnamese troops has prevented any significant tipping of the balance in favor of the South Vietnamese.

The political situation in South Vietnam continues unstable. Although the government of General Ky has stayed in power for some time and has been prosecuting the war with more success than most of his predecessors, he is supported principally because there seems to be no other non-Communist alternative.

The lack of national unity among the South Vietnamese—certainly their most serious domestic problem—seems even more pronounced today than it did at the time of my last visit there in the fall of 1963, just prior to the overthrow of President Diem.

In summary, it is my conviction on the basis of my observations that the United States is going to be needed in Asia for some time to come. Regardless of the outcome in Vietnam, Peiping will remain aggressive and threatening.

The most important foreign policy problem which our Nation will have to meet during the coming decade is almost certain to be the containment of Communist China.

Wise Selection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is a country which lives under the law. However, much depends on who administers the law.

Many newspapers, such as the Nashville Tennessean, have praised the selection of Dr. James L. Goddard as Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

As doctor of medicine he is a man of science, an extremely important qualification for the man who will be ultimately responsible for safeguarding the public from fraud and health hazards.

President Johnson has referred to Dr. Goddard's quality of leadership that will enable the Food and Drug Administration to meet fully its vast and varied responsibilities for consumer protection.

The editorial to which I refer is entitled "Good Selection To Head the FDA," and with the consent of my colleagues I ask that it be included in the RECORD:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Jan. 14, 1966]

GOOD SELECTION TO HEAD THE FDA

President Johnson has made a wise selection in naming Dr. James L. Goddard the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration.

Dr. Goddard is Assistant Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service and Chief of the Communicable Disease Center at Atlanta, which carries out programs in the control of infectious diseases. He has spent 14 years in public health work.

The new Commissioner is known as a tough, independent-minded administrator who has a strong concern for the public's welfare.

The FDA has come under congressional fire for acting slowly and indecisively when the safety of new pharmaceutical drugs was in doubt. The appointment of Dr. Goddard should give the agency renewed zeal and decisiveness.

The challenge is rather formidable, for the FDA must make scientific judgments on literally thousands of new preparations each year. But it now has an experienced administrator with a grasp of scientific issues, and the FDA ought to be a more effective agency in protecting the public.

Ukrainian Independence Day—Echo of a Great Freedom Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity to extend congratulations to the Ukraine on the 48th anniversary of its proclamation of independence. On that long-awaited day, January 22, 1918, Ukrainians experienced the exhilaration of freedom from Russian rule.

In keeping with our commemoration of this day, I would like to speak of one of the most eloquent and powerful voices of freedom—the Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. His own life, in which he enjoyed personal liberty for only a few years, mirrors the struggle of the Ukraine to obtain—and keep—its freedom as a sovereign state.

The bard of the Ukraine was born a serf in 1814 and spent the first 24 years of his life in slavery. Not until 1838 was he granted his lifelong dream of freedom, being redeemed by the poet Vasili Zhukovsky and the painter Karl Bryullov. In 1840 his first work of poetry appeared in the form of a slender volume called the "Kobzar."

His advent into the literary world was sudden, startling, and swept his compatriots up in a wave of great admiration. Such poetry as flowed from the pen of this young man had not been known in the Ukraine before. His words were bright, singing, emotional, cloaked in the language of the Ukrainian folksong, but underneath their grace throbbed a heartfelt attack upon tyranny.

In 1845 the poet associated himself with a revolutionary society which was determined to create a great, free union of all Slavonic peoples. This led to his arrest in 1847 by agents of the czar and conscription into the army, in which he was forbidden to write or draw. Yet he continued to compose, writing poems in notebooks which he sewed together and hid in his boots. After 10 years he was pardoned, but remained under police supervision for the rest of his life.

Thus, of his 47 years, Shevchenko enjoyed only 9 years as a freeman. This finds a parallel in the history of his country, for, after achieving independence in 1918, the Ukraine again came under Russian domination in 1920.

Just as Taras Shevchenko kept the spirit of freedom burning throughout his years of captivity, so does the Ukraine today hold ever before it the hope of independence and of liberty for its people. We salute the Ukraine and join with her sons everywhere in the hope that their dreams of freedom for their homeland may soon be realized.

California in Ocean Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the science of oceanography is reaching an exciting stage in California, where commercial enterprise now provides important backup to governmental and academic inquiry.

Because much of this new activity is centered in my home community of San Diego, I was interested in a résumé carried by the Christian Science Monitor in editions of Saturday, January 22:

CALIFORNIA AIDS STUDY OF OCEAN

(By Kimmis Hendrick, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

LOS ANGELES.—California is stretching toward stage 2 in exploration of its sea frontier, Gov. Edmund G. Brown says that so far the State has just "dipped its big toe" in oceanography. Soon, he promises, it will take the plunge.

This looks inevitable. California faces a population of 28 million just 15 years away. For food enough, new mineral wealth, and play space, it must mine the sea.

Stage 2 will be legislative action and moves by private industry. Stage 1 came 2 years ago when Governor Brown called a symposium on "California and the World Ocean."

Industrialists and State officials, as well as specialists in the Federal Government, participated. The symposium led to the formation of a Governor's Advisory Commission on Ocean Resources.

Its chairman is Prof. Milner B. Schaefer, director of the University of California's Institute on Marine Resources at La Jolla. Dr. Schaefer is an eminent world expert on fisheries, the law of the sea, and oceanography in general.

He organized University of California scholars into research teams. Recently they brought forth a thick tome of reports and recommendations called "California and the Use of the Ocean."

LECTURES SCHEDULED

Governor Brown says that in its way, this book is just as historymaking as the dramatic experimental work done this fall along the California coast by the Navy's Sea Lab II. Research, indeed, linked the two events in numerous ways.

California's report puts together what is doubtless the first comprehensive study by a State of its relation to the ocean. It deals with factors vital to the State's $200 million fishing industry. It deals with mineral prospects at least as promising as the gold rush. It deals with problems of urban focus on the sea coast, with weather, with engineering challenges, with recreation.

Beginning February 7, another shaping-up project will get under way. University of California Extension will start a statewide lecture series by and for scholars on the practical problems of ocean use. Speakers will include Dr. George F. Bond, officer in charge of the Navy's man in the sea program, Dr. Schaefer, and many other authorities.

Stage two for California will come, Dr. Schaefer indicates, as findings are translated into terms of legislative action. His commission's assignment is to provide details for the State planning office of the department of finance.

He points out that California's opportunity partly involves being ready to take advantage of the Federal Government's growing involvement in oceanography. Washington's concern is both defensive and civilian benefits. California's is to learn how its own public and private enterprise can profit.

"The lecture series," says John F. Brahtz, who is coordinating the lecture program, "is really a plan of action to bring us from where we are now to our goals."

Dr. Brahtz, lecturer in engineering at the University of California, Los Angeles, and staff adviser to the office of the Director of the U.S. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, has a ready adjective for "where we are now." His word is "exciting." As for goals, he says they are unlimited.

EXCITING PERIOD

"But there is much to be done," he explains. He lists a few needs: Further development of the law of the sea, a matter initiated by Geneva conventions in 1958 and since. The problem of atomic waste and the pollution of ocean depths. Engineering skills for work in "hydrospace," meaning structures for operation at tremendous depths.

"I contend men must be able to go down on the Continental Shelf in their exposed state," Dr. Brahtz declares. "Men are not just workhorses. They are decisionmakers."

California is not the only State concerned with the ocean. Hawaii, for example, held a Governor's Conference on Oceanography and Astronautics late last September. Dr. Brahtz comments that Hawaii's involvement may be smaller than California's but that he is impressed by its linking the two fields.

"Men involved in what California is doing with the ocean," he observes, "resent the Federal space program. They tend to feel the ocean holds the key to meeting human needs.

"I believe we may come to see that the two are complementary. They can serve each other."

The Balance of Payments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's economic record during the past year was remarkable for combining unprecedented advances at home with a decisive improvement in our balance of payments with foreign countries. We cut the national deficit by more than half in a single year—from nearly $3 billion to little more than $1 billion. And the great forward stride in our international payments last year reaffirms the soundness of the American dollar.

This record is a tribute to the administration's voluntary program, and to the businessmen and bankers of this Nation who made it work. As the President's economic report points out, we cannot relax and claim victory; indeed, we must strive for further improvement this year. But we have clearly brought the balance-of-payments problem under control, and we have demonstrated that our progress in international payments can go hand in hand with full prosperity.

For years, many spokesmen abroad and a few here at home have urged a tight money policy to keep dollars from flowing overseas. We were urged to throttle all credit—domestic as well as foreign—in order to correct our payments imbalance. This counsel of despair would have meant a stagnant economy. The President and his advisers wisely rejected such advice and, instead, fashioned a successful strategy. The Government did its share directly by cutting the foreign exchange cost of essential military and aid programs to the very bone. Banks and businesses also did their share.

Bank loans to foreigners, which had increased $2½ billion in 1964, rose less than half a billion dollars in 1965, staying within the guidelines set by the Federal Reserve. Corporations returned to our shores more earnings from foreign subsidiaries, and brought back funds deposited in European banks. This cost them some earnings in 1965; but it preserved the longrun prospects for growing and healthy markets at home and abroad.

For 1966, we have a reinforced program. It should bring new gains by moderating the corporate programs for direct investment which remained high in 1965.

The Council of Economic Advisers' report explains how our voluntary program works. It demonstrates that we are continuing to add to our investments and assets abroad, while holding their growth within bounds that preserve that soundness of the dollar. We can all look confidently forward to continued success of the President's strategy and to a growing world respect for the dollar.

Closing the Educational Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Hubert Humphrey spoke to the Southern Regional Conference on Education last December. It was a significant and far-reaching address—and I wish to bring the text to the attention of my colleagues.

Vice President Humphrey spoke on the need to improve educational opportunities and outlined the many educational advances that can be expected as the result of legislation we approved in the last session of Congress. His remarks undoubtedly made a great impact upon the delegates to the conference.

Under unanimous consent I insert the text of the Vice President's remarks in the Record, as follows:

Remarks of Vice President Hubert Humphrey at the Southern Region Conference on Education, Richmond, Va., December 2, 1965

Let me open with a prediction: This conference will be remembered in the history of southern education and of southern progress.

There are two reasons.

First, the far-reaching legislation passed in the last session of Congress clearly marks 1965 as the threshold of a new era for all American education.

And second, the South itself is clearly in the opening phases of a new cycle of productive development—a new development which will in large measure be fostered and sustained by its educational resources.

The American people have always believed in education and have seen in it the hope of a new day. This has been particularly true of the South.

But while there has been great ambition for good education in the South, the economic realities have limited educational opportunity. This no longer must be so.

During the last 3 years the per capita income for the South has risen to almost $2,000—20 percent below the national level, but a far higher figure than ever before for the South.

The transition from an agricultural to an urban economy is rapidly changing the South, and the gap is closing between the region and the Nation.

The economic gap is closing. There must be, too, a closing of the educational gap.

The last Congress has been called the education Congress because of its many major new programs of Federal assistance to education. We have all been staggered by President Johnson's tremendous accomplishment in breaking logjams accumulated for 25 years and longer.

Taken together, these new laws will make for profound changes, not only in the educational world, but in the nature of our future economic and social life. New programs will offer tremendous stimulus to people and communities previously left behind.

Under these new circumstances you, as leaders in education, will occupy pivotal roles in your communities. Education's financial worries are not over—they never will be—but for the first time many of you will be able to "think big."

You will find that, in the councils of government, the educator will no longer be sitting below the salt. His chair will be moving closer to the head of the table.

The educator will cease to be regarded as the humble mendicant in the statehouse. Tomorrow the educator will be seen as the man who brings wealth into the community—and not just Federal money for aid to education. For education attracts and holds business and industry, and creates new resources.

The voice of education will carry new weight in your communities and in your States.

I am here today to congratulate you upon it. And if I were to offer one word of advice I would say this: Let no false modesty dissuade you from pressing your advantage.

The young people in your care are in some respects the luckiest generation in American history. Across the board, rich and poor, they will have opportunities for life preparation and self-development such as no previous generation ever enjoyed.

But if these young people are blessed with advantages, we should remember that in the years ahead they will also be confronted with challenges which will test every ounce of their new-found strength. For every Theseus that we raise up there will certainly be a Minotaur to slay.

Let us look at some of the challenges which face this new generation:

We are challenged first and foremost by the need to insure that history's mightiest instruments of destruction will never be used. We are challenged to pursue the cause of a just and enduring peace.

We are challenged by our need to comprehend and to master the wonders of science and technology. Of all the scientists who ever lived in all the history of mankind, 95 percent are now alive and working. We must channel scientific revolution toward the creation of a better life for ourselves and for our children.

We are challenged to lift the yoke of poverty from almost one-fifth of our fellow American citizens * * * to reverse that tragic equation which has too often decreed that poor shall beget poor and ignorance shall beget misery.

We are challenged to make our cities decent places in which to live and learn, to work and play. A vast sprawling motorized population—living impersonally with computerized institutions—must somehow again become a community.

People must know each other by name, respect each other and care for each other, as people, as neighbors. The alternatives is mechanized, dehumanized chaos.

We have not yet begun to scratch the surface of this problem of retaining essential humanity in a vast new cybernetic wonderland of efficiency.

And, finally, we are challenged to make good the promise of our Constitution—to insure that all Americans shall, as citizens, have equal opportunity to enjoy the blessings of our Republic.

Education will help us broaden our productivity, should give the rising generation the tools to achieve a better life and should free it from burdens which have oppressed its parents: burdens of social disability and poverty and of self-defeating prejudice.

To meet these great challenges of our time, the Congress has laid the foundations of magnificent new educational programs. Members of Congress from the Southern States have played a leading role in the struggle to enact this legislation. Under the formulas which Congress has promulgated, the Southern States will, as a group, gain most from this legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act will help approximately 5 million educationally deprived children from low-income families. It authorizes grants to school districts in approximately 95 percent of the Nation's counties.

As you know, this act includes several important programs. It provides aid to low income districts—that is, districts with a substantial number of families with incomes of less than $2,000. Some $775 million this first year is earmarked for this type of grant.

Then there is an item of $100 million for school libraries and textbooks.

Another program provides for grants for supplementary education. There is a program for regional education libraries, and there is a program for grants to strengthen State departments of education.

Taken together, we expect the programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to bring $1.3 billion to education throughout the Nation during the first year of its operation.

Roughly a half bilion dollars will be channeled into the elementary and secondary educational systems of the States represented at this conference.

Your States will benefit handsomely from this act. You will receive more than your proportionate income tax contributions.

This is as it should be. It is our national goal to achieve a general and even prosperity. And I think we should pay tribute here to legislators from high-income States who have consistently, over the last 25 years, worked to enact programs based on this kind of formula, even though they knew that it would cost their taxpayers more than the programs would bring into their States.

Now let us look at the sums which Congress has made available for higher education. The U.S. Government will make about a half-billion dollars in grants during fiscal year 1966—the present fiscal year—under the Higher Education Act, 1965.

Under this act, the South will receive a total of almost $115 million out of a national total of $501 million.

Other Federal programs directly related to education will bring a total of almost $1.2

billion to education during the present fiscal year.

And more than a third of that total will come to your States.

Given this new assistance—and this new momentum—how can your educational institutions better discharge their responsibilities?

I have some strong opinions on that subject. I think that the educational institution must move back into the community. It must abandon some of its aspirations for isolation. It must be not a tower of ivory, but a tower of strength in the daily life of the people.

We must go back to the early European ideas of the university as part of the city, and away from the English idea—so prevalent here in the 1800's—that the institution of higher learning must be isolated from life by acres and acres of well-tended lawn.

You have a great deal to give to our cities, and your cities have a great deal to give you.

There are many community problems which would benefit more from research than from argument, and the university should be in the midst of all of them.

The learning of its faculty should always be at the service of the community. University expertise is urgently needed for the solution of dozens of complex problems—problems of transportation, of housing, of management, of law enforcement, of urban and area planning, of public welfare—yes, and of human relations. (The Higher Education Act, I might add, authorizes aid to colleges and universities entering into community service programs).

The college or university can become an integral, catalytic part of the growing partnership for constructive action increasingly seen today in America among government, business, labor, finance.

And, in participating in community affairs, the faculty will broaden its viewpoint and its sense of responsibility.

We have learned a great deal from our agricultural colleges, which have been closely related to the work-a-day needs of rural America for many years. We now have a State Technical Services Act which points toward greater usefulness to all parts of the community.

President Johnson has called it the "sleeper" of the 89th Congress.

Under this act, Government will put into the hands of private enterprise the latest fruits of research and development.

This new information will be made available to private business through 250 colleges and technical schools throughout the country.

This program will be administered by State and local officials close to the problems of their own areas.

As the President said, if we had passed this legislation 25 or 30 years ago, we might have prevented the economic problems of Appalachia today.

Here certainly is a creative opportunity for American education. This is the direction in which we must continue to move.

We need infusion, too, of more and more talented professors and teachers into schools where they are most needed. And this year's education legislation provides assistance toward this end.

For those in our society who most need education are too often today those least likely to receive it.

Students whose home environment is drab and dulling are, more likely than not, in educational environments equally drab and dulling. What hope for them in a world demanding excellence?

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides grants for innovations in our school system for new and effective teaching techniques which can lift these children—challenge them—stimulate them, before it is too late in their lives to do so.

In addition, the adventure of learning itself should be more broadly shared. The concept of clearly demarked school years—with the gates tightly shut after the graduate receives his diploma and returns his rented robes—is long outmoded. It does not fit into a way of life in which so many people have so much leisure, and so much interest in learning.

It does not fit in an era when so much of the subject matter of learning is also the subject matter of life. The relationship of the school to the individual must be a continuing one.

And this is true at the low end of the educational scale as well as the postgraduate end. The doors of the elementary schools, too, should always be open to everyone who can benefit by educational opportunity.

We are helping older people who want to achieve literacy and improve their job skills.

We are helping preschool youngsters from deprived homes to receive additional training so they can start their school years on the same level as children from more prosperous homes.

Project Head Start, in fact, will go down as one of the most successful educational programs ever undertaken in this country. For experience shows that children coming from homes of poverty and illiteracy are often too far behind to catch up in life even before they enter school. Intensive preschool programs can at least give them a more equal start.

People who, for one reason or another, have dropped out of school are encouraged to come back and resume their education.

And let me say that both President Johnson and I have very special feelings about programs of this kind, because both of us, as young men, found it necessary to drop out of school, to later return.

So let us stop thinking of schooling as a product packaged in tidy little 3- or 4-year cellophane-wrapped packages. Education is experience and experience is life. The school that lives in isolation is doomed to sterility and irrelevance.

Finally, may I say this: In the past and present, the South has given to America, and to the world, men and women of leadership. We must see to it that all the people of the South have a chance to obtain education that will allow them to develop their potentials for leadership.

There is a tremendous transition taking place in the South today. No other region of America has a greater opportunity.

The South has long led the Nation in a regional approach to graduate education. Is this not the time when a regional approach in all southern education might literally lift your States by their bootstraps?

We would welcome proposals or initiatives toward greater use of regional efforts in education, working with Federal programs.

We would welcome, in fact, any initiatives you might undertake for better education.

The great new Federal education programs enacted by the Congress do not mean Federal control of education. In fact, each act and title was written with the objective of stimulating State and local responsibility in education. For this is where it must come—locally and in the States.

Know the new laws. Then use them so that they best may fit the needs of your own schools, your own children.

Let us heed President Franklin Roosevelt who 32 years ago, in Savannah, Ga., quoted the words of John Stuart Mill:

> "The unwise are those who bring nothing constructive to the process, and who greatly imperil the future of mankind, by leaving great questions to be fought out between ignorant change on one hand, and ignorant opposition to change, on the other."

Today all of us have the chance to be constructive. We have the chance to make change a force for good and enlightenment.

Let us recognize that the true source of national power is our power of intellect—of our wealth, of our wealth of ideas—of our resources, our resources of human skill and energy.

Let us accept the challenge of the time and prove ourselves to be among the wise people.

Revision in Our Tax Structure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that revision in our tax structure is a must if we are to encourage the individual capital investment so necessary for providing jobs for our ever-increasing working force.

The amount of new risk capital required to keep our economy healthy at any given time is obviously related to population—to the demographic facts of births, deaths, longevity, retirement, and other germane matters over a period of time. As I read the figures, it now requires over $15,000 of new risk capital to bring one new little job into the world. An examination of the available data on babies growing up and wanting jobs, on automation's replacement of old jobs, with more costly new ones, and on inflation's toll on the cost of maintaining and replacing wornout or obsolete machinery, it would seem that we now need annually not only over $40 billion of new risk capital to meet our new job needs, but also at least another $40 billion of new capital each year to keep in good repair the tools of the jobs we already have.

This new capital can come directly or indirectly, from only one source—the invested savings of the individual citizen. And high taxes and unwise taxes which impede incentives to thrift, savings and investment, pose a serious threat to economic growth and full employment.

On the other hand, I well realize the fiscal plight of a Federal Treasury faced with a budget deficit of $8 billion and the inflationary consequences that might result at this time from intemperate tax reduction schemes that would merely shift our tax burdens from one group to another and thereby stifle economic growth and further choke off the reservoir from which all taxes must be paid—the excess margin of real productivity over consumption, which we call savings.

Nevertheless, there is one area of Federal tax reform which would go far toward encouraging equity investment in new and small businesses, creating new job opportunities and providing additional revenues to the Federal Government. This area exists in that portion of our Revenue Code which deals with taxation of so-called long-term capital gains. To begin with, this tax is a very poor revenue producer because of its voluntary nature and because of its unrealistic high rate.

It is my firm belief that this is an unwise, and an unfair tax. It is largely a levy on capital and not on income. It penalizes elderly owners of homes and farms who wish to sell and retire into smaller and less expensive quarters. It penalizes owners of investments who wish gradually to shift their holdings into more conservative securities as they gradually attain their less productive years. It prevents many constructive business transactions that would be in the public interest, especially the ability of small and weaker enterprises to merge with stronger organizations rather than be forced to discontinue operations which provide our citizens with jobs. And last, but not least, it has sterilized vast pools of risk capital, substantial portions of which otherwise would find their way into risk investment in new and small business ventures and thereby afford vast new employment opportunities, new productive capacity, and new sources of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It is for these reasons that I am introducing a resolution which provides that the alternate rate of tax on long-term capital gains be reduced from 25 percent to 12½ percent.

It is my firm conviction that this bill is a revenue-producing measure.

If this tax rate were so changed, investment in our economic system would receive substantial encouragement, new jobs would be created and the Treasury would actually gain revenues as a result thereof. After all, no one has to sell his capital assets, but a great many would willingly do so if the tax rate were made more realistic.

I welcome the bipartisan support of my colleagues in bringing this bill to early committee consideration, separate and apart from other revenue measures. I am sure the evidence produced before them at the attendant hearings will convince them of the wisdom of enacting this legislation.

We Do What We Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the prevailing topic among most editorial writers and other commentators has been "Can this Nation afford both guns and butter?"

Last week Mr. Norman Brewer, news director of television station WMCT in Memphis, gave an incisive commentary on the President's state of the Union message, pointing out that we must give first priority to the conflict in southeast Asia.

I certainly agree with that.

If it can be done, I think it is most important that we continue with our programs to provide everyone in the country with adequate medical protection and to give all of our children a good opportunity to acquire a first-class education.

Keeping in mind that the gross national product of this Nation is now three times what it was in the Korean conflict, it seems to me quite possible that this high goal can be achieved.

At this point in the RECORD, I include a transcript of Mr. Brewer's remarks:

WE DO WHAT WE MUST

(The Norman Brewer report, WMCT, Jan. 13, 1966)

President Johnson said last night the state of the Union is that it has "children to teach, sick to be cured, men to be freed, poor to be lifted up, cities to be built, and a world to be helped." The President said "we do what we must" and he urged that we do it all. Mr. Johnson spoke with eloquence, clarity, and determination on the war in Vietnam. He began by saying that conflict must occupy the "center of our attention." He said we will stay in Vietnam "as long as aggression commands us to battle." To yield, the President said, would "undermine the independence of many lands and whet the appetite of the aggressor and abandon Asia to the domination of the Communists." But with our guns and steel, Mr. Johnson made it clear that we seek only a just peace, In the meantime, our fighting men must have "every gun, every dollar, and every decision."

The great burden of an Asian war should be enough for this Congress. But Mr. Johnson put the crusher on. He asked the people's representatives to pursue with equal attention and vigor, the domestic programs with which he hopes to build the Great Society. He asked not for a mere continuation of all the myriad welfare programs begun last year. But an expansion of them and the opening of new Government responsibilities: From the rebuilding of "whole city slums" to highway safety.

The President spoke glowingly of a deficit this year of "only $1.8 billion." To hold it to that figure, he called for an increase in the automobile and telephone taxes reduced only 12 days ago and by some as yet vague method of "improving" the system by which Government withholds taxes from our paychecks. The possibility of further tax increases was not ruled out. This is, as Mr. Johnson said, the wealthiest Nation on earth. How long it can stay that way, Americans must wonder tonight.

Americans, already feeling the new pinch of the new social security-medicare tax, must wonder about the wisdom of accelerating domestic programs that traveled too fast for efficiency last year. They may not question that this Nation will "do what it must"—but they must question how much it can do.

The goals set by President Johnson last night—peace, health, and prosperity for all—are the goals of any humane, civilized society. The methods proposed by the President—the building of Rome in 1 day—is something for this Congress to pass on. And let the Congress remember that soon the people will have a chance to pass on this Congress.

James Dooley: Past President of the Central Labor Council of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Central Labor Council of Hawaii during the immediate past 5 years was guided by a dedicated and talented president in the person of James M. Dooley. Under his able leadership, the council proceeded with extreme effectiveness through the achievement of solidarity among the ranks of the AFL–CIO, never before known.

Mr. Dooley has now left the 50th State to accept the responsibility of the position of port agent for the Sailors Union of the Pacific in Portland, Oreg. His leadership and demonstrated concern for the public weal will be sorely missed in Hawaii. He takes with him Hawaii's heartfelt gratitude and best wishes for his future success and happiness in his new endeavor, as expressed in the resolution adopted by the Central Labor Council. I insert this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION OF CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF HAWAII, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Whereas James M. Dooley has been president of the central labor council for the past 5 years; and

Whereas James M. Dooley has served with distinction and very often performed services above and beyond the normal call of duty; and

Whereas the central labor council has flourished and grown with Brother Dooley at the helm; and

Whereas James M. Dooley's talents as a political statesman, diplomat, and prime mover have helped to achieved solidarity among the ranks of the AFL–CIO in Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the delegates assembled at this central labor council meeting do on behalf of themselves and the local unions, which they represent, commend James M. Dooley for his contribution to Hawaiian labor and offer him our sincerest appreciation and heartiest best wishes for success and happiness in his new assignment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President George Meany and Brothers Paul Hall and Morris Weisberger and to the Oregon State Federal of Labor and the Portland Central Labor Council.

Unanimously adopted this 19th day of October 1965.

A Day To Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Alexander Melnychenko, Jr., of Minneapolis, has written to call my attention to Ukrainian Independence Day which we celebrated January 22, and which the House has officially noted.

I want to join the courageous Ukrainian people and their relatives in this country in noting this historic Independence Day, proclaimed so proudly in 1918. Even though Ukrainians found their newfound freedom and independence cut short by brutal aggression, those in this country are well aware that these human aspirations continue to be the goals of the united Ukrainian people.

Mr. Melnychenko has done an excellent job of indicating why this is the case, and I take the liberty of quoting him:

Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation under Soviet domination behind the Iron Curtain. Its population of over 40 million ranks with that of England, France, or Italy. The territory exceeds in square miles that of France.

Economically, this rich territory has placed Ukraine second in the world in the mining of iron ore, third in pig iron smelting, fourth in coal mining and steel production, and at or near the top in agriculture, being particularly outstanding in livestock, sugarbeet, and grain production.

Historically, the centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. One of the first victims of Russian Communist aggression, Ukraine has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union. The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsa in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine.

The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

Why I Oppose Vietnam Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask consent to include in the RECORD the following article by Dr. John P. Roche:

A DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR EXPLAINS: WHY I OPPOSE VIETNAM CRITICS

(By Dr. John P. Roche)

(NOTE.—Dr. John J. Roche is Morris Hillquit, professor of labor and social thought at Brandeis University in Waltham, Mass. He was national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action from 1962 to 1965, and is the author of numerous works on American politics, the most recent being "Shadow and Substance, Essays on the Theory and Structure of Politics."

(The article expressing his views on the anti-Vietnam movement was written specially for the Detroit News.)

I have been actively involved in arguments over American foreign policy since the eve of World War II, but I confess that never in my memory has there been such an intense outpouring of irrational bitterness as we are seeing today.

Only the high point of "McCarthyism" could possibly match the tirades that are appearing on the subject of Vietnam, and not since I denounced the John Birch Society in print some 5 or 6 years ago have I received the kind of hate mail that has been coming in lately: "Drop dead you — babyburner."

What is peculiar about the anti-Vietnam movement (or movements—there is no monolithic organization) is that its headquarters are found in what is often called the "intellectual" sector of American society, but that the atmosphere in which it operates is reminiscent not of intellectual argument and discourse but of the primitive religious camp meeting complete with hymns, chants, and apocalyptic visions.

And what passes for argument is, at least to one who has made a life's commitment to rational discourse, appalling beyond belief. Recently, for example, after I had presented my views in support of the administration's policy a young man leaped to his feet and impaled me with "Would Christ have carried a draft card?" The best I could do was say that one intelligent question deserved another and asked him, "Would Christ have carried a social security card?"

ANTIWAR ARGUMENTS EXAMINED

Since the opponents of our intervention in Vietnam have refused to carry the logical burden of setting out their premises in coherent fashion, let me try to examine what I take to be the different grounds on which an American can rationally come out against the Vietnam war.

Starting at the simplest level, an individual may oppose the war because he does not want to take any time out from his career for military service, because it would make his mother nervous if he were in the Army, or even because the pay is insufficient.

These are quite rational stands, though hardly adequate as a foundation for national policymaking. Nor—it must be emphasized—do they supply much of a base for a radical critique of the "warfare state"—whatever the content of "radicalism" may be, it is certainly not built around the proposition "I want to survive."

Everyone has a constitutional right not to be a hero (I have exercised my privileges under this heading on occasion), but he has no right to dress up his human failings in a halo of higher morality.

By definition then, the "radical intellectual" must base his opposition to our involvement in Vietnam on principled rather than expediential grounds. And anyone claiming the status of an intellectual—radical or otherwise—is under the compelling obligation to formulate his views with logical consistency: he cannot leapfrog his premises anytime one of them begins to seem inadequate.

If he rejects violence, he must do so on the basis of generic commitments. If he says "I reject war because innocent people are killed," he is forbidden any favorite wars.

Now on what principled grounds can an intellectual denounce the war in Vietnam? It seems to me there are two principled bases of opposition.

The first is an absolute rejection of war as an instrument of international policy which should be accompanied by an equivalent rejection of violence in personal relations.

This is, of course, the classical pacifist position nobly exemplified in our time by A. J. Muste and the American Friends Service Committee. The pacifist, whether religious or humanist, has made a total dedication to a world without violence, has adopted what Max Weber called an ethic of ultimate ends, and is quite prepared to "speak truth to power" whatever may be the personal consequences.

I am unable to accept the final demands of pacifism. Yet I am quite prepared to recognize and honor those who take this position. They are spokesmen for what is probably an impossible ideal, but I hope, in the interests of my descendants, that their ideal will triumph.

However, I must live with my limitations, and I am simply not capable of arguing that the Indians should passively submit to the Chinese, the Israelis to the Arabs, or the black Rhodesians to the whites (or for that matter the Negroes of Mississippi to the Ku Klux Klan) in the name of this ultimate vision of nonviolence.

Thus, while I cannot accept his premise, I have no quarrel with the pacifist who objects to our intervention in Vietnam: He is, in Thoreau's phrase, marching to a different drum and his dedication to his objective transcends the mundane criteria of international relations as we know them. In the Augustinian sense, he is in this work but not of it—his allegiance is to a city of God which the rest of us can only imagine as a misty, remote apiration. His witness demands our respect.

If one is not a pacifist, he may still find a moral basis for condemning American policy in Vietnam by arguing that—while violence per se is not necessarily evil—the goals of public policy are immoral and corrupt all the instruments. It is not that innocent women and children are dying, but that they are dying unnecessarily as a consequence of an evil policy.

An individual with this approach could logically support war in defense of India or Israel while opposing our activities in Vietnam. But this line of argument requires considerable support. One cannot simply say that he is prepared to use violence in situation X but in situation Y on grounds of personal taste, because he likes Indians or Israelis. Any charge of immorality, in sum, has to be formulated on some consistent theoretical infrastructure.

THERE CAN BE ONLY ONE ANSWER

What basis is there for charging that we are engaged in an immoral war in Vietnam?

Pacifists excepted, there can only be one one answer: that the Communists are right and we are wrong, that we are engaged in an "unjust war." The techniques of warmaking are irrelevant—if we are wrong, it would be as immoral to fight with crossbows as with jets and napalm.

Similarly, the fact that innocent women and children are dying is in itself irrelevant—if we were right, as we presumably were in fighting Nazi Germany, the death of the innocent would be written off as an unfortunate byproduct of necessary and just acts.

We must then turn to the question of the justice of the Communist cause in Vietnam since this and this alone can provide principled grounds to the nonpacifist opponent of U.S. policy. (There are a number of expediential grounds for opposing the war and taking an isolationist posture in Asia, but we are here concerned with the moral bases of opposition.)

Prof. Eugene Genovese, of Rutgers University, stated very frankly: "I do not fear or reject the impending Vietcong victory in Vietnam. I welcome it." From his vantage point as the prophet of the Marxist weltgeist, Genovese sees the confrontation in Vietnam as one between an historically progressive north and a reactionary neocolonialist south.

If one shares Professor Genovese's Marxist religious convictions, it is patent that the United States is the "buttress of reaction," that we are trying to derail the locomotive of history, and that we are fighting a rearguard action against the forces of "historical progress."

By definition a war against socialism must be immoral—Professor Genovese and those who agree with him have thus set forth a consistent case for opposing the war. Those of his persuasion and the integral pacfists are, I submit, the only individuals who have established their standing as moral critics of American intervention.

PRACTICALITY RATHER THAN MORALITY

Let us now turn to the other types of antiwar argument which can be broadly designated as expediential or pragmatic.

Here we have a broad spectrum ranging from new-fashioned isolationists on one extreme to the "American protection is more hazardous than Communist tyranny" position at the other. These objections to our actions run against their practicality or productivity rather than their morality.

An interesting development has been the conversion of a number of liberals, and even some alleged radicals, to the dogmas of geopolitics, traditionally a reactionary entertainment.

The great expectation among these neo-Machiavellians is that, with the proper bribe, Ho Chi Minh will become a "Tito" and presumably rush to contain Red China. The problem with this is that the Red Chinese have not been leaning on Ho: Tito, after all, did not become a "Tito" for the sheer novelty of it. But our geopolitical finaglers may devise some way of getting the Chinese Communists to put the arm on Ho (perhaps with a research grant from the CIA).

A variation on the geopolitical theme suggests that we should turn the South Vietnamese over to Ho, make the Russians happy, the Red Chinese mad, and thus stimulate the Sino-Soviet schism. Somebody has, I think, suggested that we could improve this scenario by giving the South Vietnamese to the Russians to give to Ho.

I think this bush league Machiavellianism is childish nonsense: for one thing, it is unwise to dabble in the heresies of other men's churches. Moreover, E. H. Carr's observation on a similar effort in geopolitical horse trading sticks in my mind as a warning to our self-styled "realists."

"The negotiations," Carr remarked in 1939, "which led up to the Munich Agreement of September 29, 1938, were the nearest approach in recent years to the settlement of a major international issue by a procedure of peaceful change." Unfortunately, the Nazis refused to stay bought and Carr had to do some rewriting for the next edition of this work.

The most persuasive argument for getting out of Vietnam rests on what might be called updated isolationism. Ironically, isolationism is in the 1960's a functional position; i.e., it is feasible for the United States to devote itself wholeheartedly to affluence in one country and let the rest of the world slide off into chaos.

Weapons technology has ended our need for foreign bases: with ICBM's and naval power we no longer have any military rationale for involvement outside of the Western Hemisphere. (The Soviet Union is in roughly the same position and obviously there are strong drives toward isolationism within the Soviet leadership.)

The Tory shadow Minister of Defense, Enoch Powell, recently suggested to the Conservative Party Conference that the British should liquidate their commitments east of Suez-and watch development from the sidelines; a leftwing Laborite intellectual (with the casual racism which is so pervasive in British conversation) put it to me more bluntly: "Let the woggies fight it out."

SELFISHNESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

In this spirit—which is profoundly conservative in the psychological sense—an American can argue that the game in Asia is not worth the candle.

What difference does it make in the overall balance of world power whether South Vietnam is inside or outside the Communist sphere? Why lose American lives and waste American resources? Why generate internal tensions, risk a revival of "McCarthyism," chance a general war? Why get involved in a quarrel in a faraway country between people of whom we know nothing? More broadly, what difference does it make to us if the Africaners butcher the Bantu, the Arabs overrun the Israelis, or the Chinese crush India?

Now that "Fortress America" is a militarily viable proposition (vulnerable only to a nuclear attack which a policy of disengagement from the world could hardly provoke), why not pull back behind the moat and enjoy ourselves?

After all, who are we to impose our value system on other people; Sukarno may have known his customers better than we do when he observed that democratic government was not "in harmony with the Indonesian soul."

It is not my intention to caricature this position—although I obviously have no use for it, it has to be understood as the most effective rationale for disengaging, not merely from Asia but from Africa and even Europe, as well.

There is a liberal version which emphasizes cultural relativism ("What right do we have to tell Asians how to run their affairs?") and a reactionary version which pushes racism ("Asians—or Africans—are incapable of building free societies"), but the net result is a united front of utilitarians in full agreement that national selfishness should be the foundation of American foreign policy.

And what strikes me about the current debate on Vietnam is that most of the opponents of our intervention spout moral axioms like a geyser but in fact rest their position on precisely this new isolationism, this modern international application of what Karl Marx called the "pig philosophy." I have no objection to Sermons on the Mount, but I have no interest in hearing one from Machiavelli.

As I am out of sympathy with the anti-Vietnam movement and only the pacifist critique has any attraction for me, I should briefly explicate the basis of my support for the defense of South Vietnam.

I dislike war intensely; 3 years of my life were excised as neatly as an appendix by World War II, and the last thing I would wish for anyone is a similar journey into limbo, if not Hell. But I am not prepared to turn 15 million South Vietnamese over to the Communist terror regime in Hanoi.

EFFECTIVE MILITARY CONTROL

Yet this is what unilateral disengagement—no matter how much it is prettied up—amounts to. One demographic point should be made perfectly clear: 95 percent of the population of South Vietnam lives on roughly 20 percent of the land area. Thus the allegation that the Vietcong "controls" 80 percent of the countryside" has no representational significance. About 80 percent of Vietnam has no significant population (less than 20 per square kilometer) and it is these jungle plateaus which the Vietcong "control."

In other words, in effective military terms the United States and South Vietnamese forces "control" those sections of South Vietnam—the cities, the coastal plains—where the population concentration rivals that in Belgium.

I emphasize this because the casual newspaper reader might have the impression that most of the population of South Vietnam is already under Vietcong control so that our departure would have only a marginal impact.

This demographic situation is also important in two other contexts: first, it makes the "enclave theory"—which I was one of the first to propose—quite feasible. We can hold the population centers indefinitely, establish ground security (particularly in the delta), and let the Vietcong and the NLF exercise unlimited sovereignty over the bush. The enclave theory provides a sound basis for fighting a limited war.

Second, if one examines carefully where in the South there has been intense bombing, he discovers that the overwhelming percentage of strikes have been in areas of low population intensity. In Pleiku Province, for example, where the heavy bombers have been extremely active, the normal civilian population is about 5 per square kilometer; in Binh Duong, another prime target, the population is less than 100 per square kilometer and this population is concentrated in five towns which the bombers have avoided.

MINIMAL IMPACT ON THE PEOPLE

In short, the common notion that American aircraft are bombing and strafing the Vietnamese equivalent of Dearborn, Mich., is completely inaccurate. Indeed, there has not been a single bomber strike, or strategic air-to-ground strike by fighter aircraft (i.e., a strike which is not part of a ranging battle) in any administrative subdivision of South Vietnam with a populaton concentration of more than 190 per square kilometer.

The United States has made every effort to operate with minimal impact on the Vietnamese people—and the 700,000 to 800,000 refugees from the Vietcong who are thronging camps in the South obviously voted with their feet for the Saigon Government.

The nub of the matter is that the Hanoi regime is a brutal, ruthless dictatorship. (Ho and Giap disposed of their version of Students for a Democratic Society in 1946–47—"unreliable elements," "Trotskyites," and hemi-demi-semi-Marxists, who had fought for independence against the French were summarily executed.

I recently met a Vietnamese doctor who was, in 1945–46, a leader of the Viet Minh in the South, was deemed a "Trotskyite" by Giap, invited to an underground meeting in Hanoi, and betrayed to the French. Fortunately, the French officer assigned to execute him turned out to be a former classmate at the Ecole Polytechnique who permitted him to escape.

The Hanoi regime has operated a massive terror in the North—murdering perhaps 200,000 alleged "kulaks" in the course of collectivizing agriculture—and has sought to extend its terrorist hegemony to the South, where about 30,000 South Vietnamese officials have been murdered since 1960. Hanoi's aim, clearly expressed, is the "liberation" and "unification" of the South and only American power has stood in the way.

I am glad that we have rejected the selfish counsels of isolationism and intervened to defend the South. Rightly or wrongly, I beleive that the American people have an obligation to other human beings, that our power in the world should be used within the limits of prudence to forward the ideals that we cherish.

This does not mean that we impose democratic institutions on the South Vietnamese, but it does involve our making it possible for the South Vietnamese to continue the search for alternatives rather than being assimilated into a frozen dictatorship.

Unfortunately, we rarely have a nice clean choice in this world between good and evil and the South Vietnamese Government hardly inspires the enthusiasm generated by the late Spanish Republic. Yet differences of degree are crucial, nobody can argue that South Vietnam is a dictatorship (its key problem is weakness) and the possibilities of future growth in freedom do exist.

It is perhaps unreasonable to ask Americans to fight and possibly die for such a tenuous objective. As Norman Thomas pointed out in 1940, it was absurd to ask Americans to die for a crew of Polish fascists (he has updated the same speech for current use). But in 1940 (as in 1966) the real issue was not the relative immorality of the Poles (or the Saigon regime) but the character of the aggressor.

After agreeing with Norman Thomas—and marching around in antiwar demonstrations in 1940–41—I came later to realize that in opposing American intervention against Hitler, I had unknowingly countersigned the death warrants of perhaps 30 million people.

I resolved that never again would I support—to recall E. H. Carr's phrase—a "settlement of a major international issue by a procedure of peaceful change" which involved turning human beings over to a dictatorship.

This is perhaps a hopelessly naive position for a professor of politics to endorse, but it has the virtue of simplicity in a world where complex explanations are generally an excuse for inaction or for escaping from the starkness of reality.

When all is said and done, the fact is that Ho Chi Minh would put me against a wall and shoot me—a sound action from his ideological viewpoint. He would also shoot most of the intellectual leaders of the antiwar movement—indeed he already has shot any North Vietnamese intellectual who showed signs of independent thought.

At the risk of seeming anti-intellectual, I long ago decided never to give an inch to anyone who would shoot me or those who share my ideals. Those intellectuals who enjoy the luxury of living in a society where dissent is a magazine and not a capital offense, seem to me to have lost sight of this vital human imperative.

The Menace of Drunken Drivers on Our Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, last December there was a tragic accident caused by a drunken driver on an interstate highway which resulted in the death of the wife and youngest daughter of the Stark County superintendent of schools. Stan Perrin has been a longtime personal friend of mine, a very fine Christian gentleman, an outstanding citizen and pillar of his community. He raises the question as to whether Federal legislation is in order.

The matter of drunken drivers on our streets and highways is certainly a matter of concern in the area of highway safety, which the President in his state of the Union message says should be dealt with in this session of the Congress. I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the full text of Mr. Perrin's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD and commend its reading to my colleagues, with the hope that it might put some wheels in motion to remedy this unconscionable carnage on our highways:

OFFICE OF COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT
OF SCHOOLS, STARK COUNTY, ILL.,
Toulon, Ill., January 17, 1966.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress, House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: As you no doubt know by now that a drunken driver killed two of my loved ones, my wife, Gertrude and my youngest daughter, Judy, on December 18, 1965, in Missouri. We were driving to California to spend Christmas with our folks out there. We were traveling on Interstate 44 between Springfield and Mount Vernon, Mo. The driver, who was drunk, was driving down the wrong direction on a four-lane highway.

My daughter cried out, "Dad, here comes a car." For a moment I was so startled when I heard this as I was in the passing lane and was watching the traffic on my right and naturally was not expecting any traffic coming toward us. By instinct I pulled the car to the left to try to avoid him, as I could not turn to the right because we were passing cars which were in the right lane. If I had had a little more time I could have missed him, but as it happened he hit my right fender in front and tore through the entire right side of the car killing my loved ones instantly. They never had a chance.

When I finally stopped we were down in the median and by some chance the car did not upset. I was dazed for a couple of minutes and finally got out of the car to assess the damage. I went around on the other side and there I found my wife and daughter laid out. It was a horrible picture that will remain in my mind forever. I hope you never have to experience such a thing.

Here is a case of two fine talented, Christian people killed by an irresponsible known alcoholic who had had several other wrecks previously. This is no different than letting a criminal run at large with a gun shooting at people. Judy was to graduate from Bradley University on January 30, 1966, and had a position waiting for her in the Oak Park, Ill., schools beginning February 1.

Many people in this area and elsewhere, who know us, are certainly up in arms over this and have asked me to write to you seeking your help in getting some Federal legislation to protect others from drunken drivers. The U.S. Constitution guarantees each individual the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Gertrude and Judy were deprived of this by a drunk. It seems that the Presideent, Congress, and the Supreme Court are so obsessed with sponsoring civil rights. They should be equally obsessed in trying to put a stop to drinking and driving, which is just as much a part of civil rights as the Negro situation. There is a Federal law against kidnaping punishable by death. It is much more serious for a drunken driver to kill innocent persons as it is to kidnap someone.

Therefore, I strongly urge you to do everything in your power to enact a Federal law that will be tough that it will deter this carnage on our highways. More than one-half of the highway fatalities are due to drunken drivers.

I would like to see a law that automatically carried a penalty of life imprisonment of a drunken driver who killed a person on the highway and 10 years imprisonment of an individual who is caught drinking and driving. Also included in such legislation should be provision for requiring a test of an individual who is suspected of drinking and a further provision similar to the Dram Act in Illinois that will hold tavern operators responsible for selling liquor to individuals after they have had too much and then go out to drive on the highway.

Probably the liquor interests will fight this kind of legislation, but something drastic must be done.

It is ironical that all of my life I have been against drinking and then have two of my family killed by a drunk.

If you would sponsor such legislation and could get it enacted into law you would gain the esteem and admiration of many people in this area as well as in other parts of the country. My relatives and their friends in California are writing to officials out there to back some legislation relative to implied consent for testing drivers suspected of drinking. I understand Gov. Pat Brown is against this. That figures.

I plan to do everything in my power to get protection for others against drunken drivers, so they will not cause others to suffer the heartaches I am experiencing due to such individuals. I plan to write some open letters to various newspapers using some of the ideas expressed to you.

Please do everything you can to help me and others, BOB. Your efforts will be gratefully appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
STAN PERRIN.

P.S.: If you have the opportunity, please show this letter to Senators DIRKSEN and DOUGLAS, as well any others in the House. Thanks.

STAN.

Scrimping at Veterans' Hospitals Strains Ties With Medical Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 89th Congress, on October 19, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 11668, which would provide for closer cooperation between the medical training schools of this country and the Veterans' Administration.

Earlier this month, the National Observer, one of the Nation's foremost newspapers published an article which points up the problem which H.R. 11668 intends to correct. The author, Walter A. Damtoft, who, I might parenthetically point out, is another North Carolinian who is distinguishing himself in the field of journalism, has very cogently described the "fraying partnership" between the Veterans' Administration and our Nation's teaching hospitals.

This news article eloquently supports the argument for immediate attention to a very serious problem, the deterioration of relationships between the VA and the medical schools which are affiliated with the veterans hospital program.

I would like to have Mr. Damtoft's story printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that other Members of the House may have the opportunity to become more familiar with the problem. The article follows:

A FRAYING PARTNERSHIP: SCRIMPING AT VETERANS' HOSPITALS STRAINS TIES WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS

(By Walter A. Damtoft)

For several years physicians attributed the severe chest pains suffered by a middle-aged World War II veteran to psychosomatic reaction to an earlier heart attack. Whether the pain was real or imagined, the veteran was unable to work. Finally he was examined at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Durham, N.C., a stark, red-brick structure a long block from the Gothic buildings of the Duke University Medical Center.

VA and Duke Hospital physicians made intensive tests and examinations, including cineangiographs, or movie X-rays, of coronary blood vessels. The patient was found to have real cause for pain: A heart muscle wasn't getting adequate blood. The veteran now awaits an operation to sew blood vessels from his chest wall to the heart muscle to supplement its blood supply.

The diagnosis and the heart operation that likely will enable this veteran to return to work are among the medical advantages of a strikingly successful affiliation of many medical schools with VA hospitals. But these partnerships, fashioned in desperation at the end of World War II, are beginning to fray. As is the case in so many marriages, the basic problem is money.

EQUIPMENT GROWS OBSOLETE

In surveys conducted by both the VA and the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC), many medical-school deans have complained that VA hospitals are becoming understaffed and that much of their equipment, particularly X-ray devices, is becoming obsolete. Some deans even speak reluctantly of terminating their affiliations unless the Government sees to it that VA hospitals are operated at a level comparable to medical school hospitals.

"The end of the Veterans' Administration-medical school relationship is preordained" if more Federal money is not forthcoming, says Dr. S. Richardson Hill, dean of the Medical College of Alabama at Birmingham.

"We would be highly reluctant to give up the advantages" of the partnership, says Dean William G. Anlyan of the Duke Medical School in prefacing comment that termination of the school's affiliation with the Durham (N.C.) VA Hospital may have to be considered.

A DRAMATIC GESTURE?

The dean of a medical school in the Chicago area, who insists on anonymity, is sharply critical of the VA system of allocating funds on the basis of average daily patient count in a hospital. "They just don't realize that that is not the criteria of good care these days," says the dean. "Good care today means get them in fast, give them excellent care, and get them up and out in a far shorter stay." The dean adds it would not surprise him if one of the Chicago medical colleges dropped out of the program in a dramatic gesture to point up the problem.

Dean Robert Glazer of the Stanford Medical School at Palo Alto, Calif., typifies many deans in speaking well of the rapport that has existed between his school and its affiliated VA hospital. The two, he says, "are facing together the problem of inadequate Government funds." But Stanford, he adds, woud have "no choice but to change this relationship" if the VA hospital is unable to maintain "what we consider adequate training facilities."

Deans have come to Washington to ask Congress for more money. But the problem, some of them feel, is not lack of interest by Congress but in official Washington's preoccupation with holding down domestic Government costs in the face of rising war bills from South Vietnam.

UNDER PRESIDENTIAL PRESSURE

The Bureau of the Budget, says one medical educator, is under "fairly obvious pressures" by the President to hold the line on VA medical costs.

The result, says this educator, is that VA hospitals are having "to shift money for running elevators into dialysis machines and that is not the way to run a hospital." Frustrated in his quests in Washington for more money, this educator is thinking of using the mounting number of veteran casualties from South Vietnam as the basis for a new appeal. The VA hospital would be emphasized as a defense resource, a distinction now muddled, since only about 20 percent of the 107,002 patients now in VA hospitals are there for treatment of disabilities connected with military service. The rest are veterans who say they cannot afford private medical care.

Today, however, a compelling argument can be made that the wounded veteran returning from Vietnam is entitled to the best of care. Such an argument might well be harder for the administration to ignore than the contention that the quality of VA medical care is slipping.

JUST "GOOD SERGEANTS"

Top VA officials do not concede that money is a major problem. This may be sincere conviction but, then, they may also be acting as good sergeants in a command dedicated to holding the line on VA medical costs now running at about $1,192 million a year.

Medical school deans have a double reason for insisting that VA hospitals be topflight. They insist, first, that the veteran is entitled to the best. But they also insist that VA hospitals and medical school hospitals be substantially equal in staff and facilities so that medical students or residents have equal opportunity to advance their education, regardless of whether assigned to a VA or a school hospital.

Dean Anlyan, of Duke, one of the educators most concerned with what he regards as deterioration in the quality of care in VA hospitals, says that "as medicine has become more sophisticated and hospital care has become more expensive, the VA has not kept up with the ability to give the VA patient the same level of care as given in our (Duke) hospital.

HE IS GROWING RELUCTANT

Leaning forward in his chair and clasping his hands together, Dr. Anlyan explains that Duke supervises all medical staffing at the VA hospital with which it is affiliated. He is becoming reluctant to ask bright young doctors to serve residencies at the VA hospital because, he says, lack of Government funds is causing curtailment of staff and use of some obsolete equipment at the VA hospitals.

Dr. Barnes Woodhall—Duke's provost in charge of medical affairs, a former dean of its medical school and chairman of a liaison committee between the VA and medical schools—describes what he and Dr. Anlyan regard as some of the inadequacies of the Durham VA hospital. The hospital should have four radiologists but has funds for only two. It received $33,000 in the past 5 years to modernize X-ray equipment; in the same period Duke ordered new equipment worth $125,000.

In Birmingham, Dean Hill says the care of veterans at the VA hospital would be substandard and its residency program subject to serious doubt if the University of Alabama were not subsidizing it with medical services valued at more than $600,000 annually.

FRESH FROM MILITARY DUTY

VA-medical school partnership was established when the VA urgently needed hundreds of young physicians to help care for the influx of World War II veterans. But at that time the VA hospitals had a reputation as second-rate medical institutions. Most young doctors, many of them fresh from military duty themselves, preferred to round out their medical education as residents in hospitals where they could learn their specialties under medical teachers of stature.

By affiliating VA hospitals with medical schools, the services of leading medical professors became available to VA patients. Residencies in VA hospitals then became more attractive to young doctors. The quid pro quo for the medical schools was more teaching hospitals and thus a greater variety of medical cases for the students to study.

For 19 years, veterans, school deans, and VA administrators have been all but unanimous in their enthusiasm for the plan. The cooperative venture currently involves 69 general VA hospitals and 18 psychiatric hospitals in an association with 76 of the 85 U.S. medical schools. More than 16,000 medical students now receive at least a part of each year's medical training at a VA hospital.

PATIENTS FROM REMOTE AREAS

Most new VA hospitals are being constructed close to medical schools. Hospitals located in medically remote spots, often as the result of political pressure, frequently refer their difficult cases to the nearest VA hospital with a medical-school affiliation. And that, say Dr. Anlyan and Dr. Woodhall in North Carolina, is a major factor in what they regard as the growing inadequacy of Federal funding of VA hospitals.

Dr. Anylan contends that VA hospital budgets are based on per day patient-cost formulas that, while possibly adequate for the care of the more routine cases at VA hospitals not affiliated with a medical school, are now far too low to pay for the intensive patient care that Duke insists must be maintained in the VA hospital to keep it comparable with the Duke Hospital.

The per-day cost of care of a patient at Duke Hospital now runs around $40; at he Durham VA hospital it is $31.27. Duke has a resident physician for every two beds, the VA hospital one for every four. Duke has one staff physician for every 4 beds, the VA one to every 17. Duke has three hospital personnel, excluding physicians, per patients; the VA has one.

Dr. Anlyan argues that though the per-day cost at Duke is higher, the per illness cost is less because the intensive care enables the hospital to discharge a patient after a stay that is usually only a half or a third as long as a comparable veteran patient would spend in the VA hospital.

Perhaps because this is the Federal budget-making season, the VA's defense of its funding of hospitals is cautious and a little ambivalent. Dr. Marc J. Musser, the VA's deputy chief medical director defends the per patient per day system of allocating funds as a method that permits each hospital's budget to reflect local salary scales. He says that, by and large, Congress has given the VA what it wanted to finance medical care of veterans.

But in disputing Dr. Anlyan's contention that VA college-affiliated hospitals are being starved for funds, Dr. Musser manages to suggest that the VA could use more money. The VA is "keenly aware," he says, that hospitals like the Durham VA facility have special cost problems because they serve as referral hospitals for other VA hospitals and tend to get the most complicated medical cases. Says Dr. Musser: The VA is trying "very desperately" to equip and fund these hospitals to carry out this special function.

Establishment of the VA-medical school partnership in 1946 went a long way toward ending the medical isolation of the VA hospital. The current ferment, if it evolves according to the hopes of the medical-school deans, may make these hospitals full-fledged members of the U.S. medical community.

Humane Slaughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile well-meaning people not acquainted with the facts subscribe to an attack upon the method of slaughtering animals in the manner required by the Jewish faith. This matter has in the past, been a subject of discussion on the floor of this House.

Everyone who is familiar with the subject knows that shechita is a humane method of slaughter, but in view of the campaign presently underway in New York, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the Congress Bi-Weekly of January 10, 1966:

THE MEAT YOU EAT

We are happy to learn that Brigitte Bardot cannot bear the fact "that the meat you eat is seared with pain," as a recent anguished ad in the New York Times proclaimed. We applaud Mademoiselle Bardot's humanitarian instincts in assuming the honorary chairmanship of the Friends of Animals and pay our respects as well to the other luminaries who signed and we presume helped pay for the ad.

We have distinct reservations, however, about their judgment. Any intelligent reading of the ad should have made them wary about its thrust—an effort to undermine shechita (Jewish ritual slaughter) in the public eye. Without analyzing specifically the hints, innuendoes, half-truths that comprise the ad, it suffices to observe that its aim is to draw a distinction for the consumer between the humane and kosher, a distinction which the U.S. Congress refused summarily to draw when it enacted its humane slaughter bill and specifically stated that shechita is a humane method of slaughter, perhaps the most humane method in practice today.

The ad seeks members for the FOA and, naturally, funds for advancing in New York and Hausbeck bill which "will end the cries of pain and terror for all animals." We are equally concerned to end this horrifying din but we subscribe to a humane slaughter measure which is supported by every long-standing and respected organization concerned with the welfare of animals, such as the New York Humane Association and the ASPCA, and which does not disingenuously impute evil to shechita.

It is, incidentally, a commentary on the ad's probity that it seeks to imply that the Hausbeck bill is opposed only by Orthodox rabbis. The fact is that it is opposed by all six major Jewish rabbinical and congregational organizations, Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox. It is true and unfortunate that a small but vocal group of Orthodox rabbis oppose all legislation on the subject, fearing that any legislation may subsequently outlaw shechita—a fear that is understandable if unfounded.

We suggest to Mademoiselle Bardot and the other stars of stage, screen, and pulpit that they would do well to give the same attention to the ads they sign as they do to the scripts they recite for public edification.

Bypassing the Courts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Wall Street Journal on its editorial of January 24, entitled "Bypassing the Courts".

Americans enjoy the privilege of dissent through lon-honored, legal heritage.

To use service in the Armed Forces as punishment is to demean the worth of the soldier and the meaning of his contribution to his country.

To press a young man into the service as punishment for his political views is to violate all democracy means to us.

To mete out justice without the benefit of the courts is to fly in the face of the American Constitution inasmuch as it insures certain rights of individuals.

BYPASSING THE COURTS

When the Justice Department finds it necessary to assert that the Selective Service Act cannot be used to stifle any "constitutionally protected expression of views," such as student protests against U.S. policy on Vietnam, the public can hardly feel overwhelming confidence in the way the draft law is being administered.

The Government's position is stated by Assistant Attorney General Vinson in a letter to Senator Hart. The Michigan Democrat had questioned the reclassification to 1–A of some University of Michigan students who had staged a sit-in at the Ann Arbor, Mich., draft board offices to protest Vietnam policy.

The students were found guilty of trespass, under a local ordinance, and were fined. Selective Service Director Hershey then declared that an existing Executive order permits the Selective Service System to reclassify anybody "found to be delinquent" under the act. He ruled that the student demonstrators were delinquent because they interfered with the local draft board's operations, such interference being a violation of the draft law.

The Justice Department, on the other hand, states that no such Executive order exists. "Where opinion is expressed, if there is no transgression of law, then no sanctions can be imposed," the Department's letter continued. "If there is a transgression, then the sanctions which attach to it"—in this case, punishment for trespass—"are all that should be applied."

Although Draft Director Hershey says he agrees that the draft law should not be used to punish people for their opinions, he has not yet retreated from his position that the students broke the draft law with their sit-in and thus were punishable. And Michigan Selective Service officials have made it clear that they won't move without fresh orders from headquarters.

Whatever the exact legal rules in this case, equity certainly demands that anyone accused of breaking a law get a fair trial. If administrators acquire the right to bypass the courts and assess arbitrary punishment, then the safety not only of draft-age youth but of all of us will be the less.

Illinois Resolution Adopted at National Convention of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of the Members to Resolution 222, adopted by the 1965 convention of the American Legion, as proposed by the Illinois Department. I also wish to point out that the immediate past commander of Argo-Summit Post No. 735, in my district, is Mr. Anzelm A. Czarnowski, who performed a great public service as an undercover agent of the FBI:

RESOLUTION 222 (ILLINOIS)

Resolution commending persons who combat communistic and subversive activities by undertaking dangerous missions necessary to the security of the Nation

Whereas in defense of our Nation many are called upon to undertake dangerous missions into the ranks and country of the enemy by infiltration or by parachute drop, to seek out information valuable to the military or to disrupt the internal affairs of the enemy country. This type of service is to a great extent considered glamorous or romantic, and volunteers are fairly easy to obtain, and the exploits of these courageous individuals have been well publicized all to their glory, and nothing herein is to detract from these great exploits.

Whereas there is another important mission, necessary to the security of the Nation, that of infiltration into communistic and other subversive groups on the home front to obtain information as to the extent of enemy action actually within the country itself, which has the aim of overthrowing the U.S. Government; and

Whereas many courageous civilians have been called upon to assist the law-enforcement agencies, particularly the FBI and the several committees of the U.S. Congress to perform this nonglamorous trying and drudgery work of actual infiltration and, in many cases, becoming members of communistic and subversive groups and the reports, information and testimony supplied by these courageous civilians have been the basis of important legislation, as well as exposure of the enemy within and the dangerous conditions present also which alerted many other patriotic groups to combat communistic and subversive activities; and

Whereas when the identity of these courageous civilians became known at the time they publicly appeared to testify as to their findings, including the identity of individuals associated with Communist and subversive causes; and

Whereas these courageous civilians were denounced by the Red press and others who joined in the chorus and referred to these courageous civilians as stool pigeons, stooges, and other derogatory terms, all with the aim of deprecating this valuable work so important to the internal security of the Nation: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Portland, Oreg., August 24–26, 1965, That it does hereby commend these courageous civilians for their dangerous and valuable work in the service of their country.

Joseph C. Murphy,
Department Commander.

Attest:
Chester F. Newby,
Department Adjutant.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year when we pause to pay tribute to the courage of a brave and proud people on the 48th anniversary of independence on the Ukraine, we do so once again in the face of tragedy and cynicism. For the Ukrainians remain enchained by the bonds of an alien power, the Communist empire of the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainians have remained more or less under the heel of Russian tyranny ever since the 17th century, and the independence day which we are now celebrating marks the beginning of a mere 2 years of freedom, a brief flicker of the light of liberty amid centuries of darkness. The Ukrainians fought bravely to preserve the liberty they had achieved on the first day of November 48 years ago. It was a glorious day, but already the young Republic was surrounded by powerful enemies—the imperial dynasties of Austria and Germany and the arrogant young Communist state in Russia.

With Germany finally out of the war, the newly formed Red army moved quickly into the eastern sector of the country in early 1920. Before long the entire country had been overrun and the freedom of the Ukrainians had been brutally smashed once again.

Behind the Red army came the Communist commissars who stood ready to crush the spirit of liberty along with the political freedom of the Ukrainian people. But where the brutal might of the Red army was able to succeed, the assimilating process of the Communist commissars has failed, and failed miserably. Despite their desperate plight, the Ukrainians have not allowed the Communists to bend their unbreakable spirit. Amidst the ashes of defeat, the spirit of liberty in the Ukrainian people burns brightly.

That, I submit, is why this anniversary of Ukrainian independence is so terribly important to freedom-loving people everywhere. For the spirit of the Ukrainians, their refusal to submit to the harshest possible attempts at acculturation into a totalitarian Communist society, stands as a shining example to us all. Western visitors have reported that a brief trip to the Ukraine brings this point home even to the most casual observer. After the dreary, dark, and sullen atmosphere of the typical Communist country that pervades much of the Soviet Union itself, it is a refreshing pleasure to simply observe the cheerful and independent spirit of the Ukrainians, not to mention the rugged beauty of their homeland.

The present fate of our Ukrainian friends represents one of the great tragedies of modern man, the totalitarian enslavement that seems peculiarly a part of the darker side of the 20th century. On the other hand, their undying courage and independent spirit stand as a monument to the strength of man in the face of the cruelest odds.

This 48th anniversary of Ukrainian independence must necessarily be a solemn occasion. Nevertheless, in the faith and courage of the Ukrainian people there is always a good deal of cause for rejoicing.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to participate in this commemoration of Ukrainian Independence Day by the House.

This date, January 22, is as significant to the people of the Ukraine as our own Independence Day, July 4, is to us. In addition, it holds great significance for this and every other free nation because it serves to remind us that there are hundreds of millions of people who live under the heavy hand of Communist imperialism.

The United States must never forget the plight of the enslaved citizens of the Ukraine, of the captive nations of Eastern Europe and of every other nation in the world which suffers today under the yoke of communism. This is why we are fighting today in Vietnam—to prevent the people of that embattled country from slipping into the waiting hands of tyranny.

This day is also an excellent occasion upon which to declare our support, once again, for the creation of a Special Committee on the Captive Nations in the House of Representatives—at a time when there are more than two dozen Communist-dominated nations in the world, when the peoples of these countries have no real voice in their government, nor freedom nor self-determination, and when every fighter for freedom looks for a sign from this cradle of liberty that he is not alone in his fight and can depend upon the United States for continued support and encouragement.

The Small Business Administration Loan Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes. Under the bill, proceeds from the sale of such participation certificates would be credited to the Small Business Administration's revolving loan fund.

On July 23, 1965, the Honorable Eugene Foley, then Administrator of the SBA, addressed a congressional forum on the Small Business Administration which I sponsored in the Fifth District of New York. The forum, held at the Freeport High School in Freeport, N.Y., was attended by more than 250 businessmen to learn more about the programs and services of the agency.

As a result of the forum, many businessmen on the south shore of Long Island applied for small business loans. While a large number of the loans were approved and the recipients are pleased with the services and programs offered, other applicants later in the year were told that a moratorium had been placed on all small business loans as a result of the hurricane disaster in New Orleans.

The proposed legislation would increase the efficiency and turnover of the revolving fund; reduce the need for additional congressional appropriations to the revolving fund as the demand for loans increase; and the increased availability of funds would prevent future moratoriums on the individual loan program as a result of disasters such as Hurricane Betsy.

This legislation was introduced in the Senate by Senator PROXMIRE and hearings were conducted by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee last October, just prior to adjournment. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, the distinguished chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee introduced the bill in the House.

Ninety-five percent of all businesses in the United States is small business and we should make every effort to strengthen the Small Business Administration programs and loan fund. In recent years the number of applicants for small business loans has more than doubled and Congress has appropriated additional amounts to the Small Business Administration revolving fund.

Last year the hurricane damage to small business was so great that a temporary freeze on all individual loans was announced. I believe the Congress should pass legislation to strengthen the existing programs and if necessary separate the individual loans fund from the disaster fund. By authorizing Small Business Administration to sell participating interests in such loans on the private market, we will strengthen the resources for small business loans.

This legislation does not require additional appropriations—rather it would reduce the necessity for continuous additions to the revolving fund.

Gen. Courtney Hicks Hodges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 16, 1966, at the age of 79, one of our Nation's most famous generals died in San Antonio, Tex.

Gen. Courtney Hodges was one of the heroes to defeat Nazi Germany in World War II. Under his command the famous 1st U.S. Army was the first to reach Paris and to enter Germany. It was elements of his army that crossed the bridge at Remagen. The 1st Army also captured Aachen, Germany, participated in the bloody battle of Huertgen Forest in November 1944, and after 2 weeks of bitter fighting broke through in the Battle of the Bulge.

With his Army he crossed the Rhine at Cologne on March 7, 1945. On April 15, 1945, he was promoted to a four star general.

General Hodges was born January 5, 1887 at Perry, Ga., the son of a newspaper publisher. After entering West Point at 17, Hodges dropped out because of difficulty with geometry. He promptly enlisted as a private in the 17th infantry at Fort McPherson. Three years later in 1909, he won a competitive examination and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry. His career as an officer took him to the Mexican Border Expedition and both World Wars. He was regimental commander with the 5th Division in Larraine, Meuse-Argonne, and St. Mihiel offensives in World War I.

After the war, he was graduated from the Army Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., in 1920. He then became the first non-West Point graduate to become an instructor at the famed Military Academy. In 1944 General Hodges became deputy commander to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, then commanding general of the 1st U.S. Army.

When General Bradley took over the 12th Army Group, General Hodges took over the 1st Army. He was an officer who enjoyed democratic relations with his troops and once said: "We are a democracy and we have a democratic army. That is one of our great strongpoints." General Bradley characterized Hodges as "a spare, soft-voiced Georgian without temper, drama, or visible emotion, who was left behind in the European headline sweepstakes." Bradley also wrote that Hodges "was essentially a military technician whose faultless techniques and tactical knowledge made him one of the most skilled craftsmen of my entire command."

Among the numerous decorations earned by General Hodges in his 43-year-old career in peace and war were: Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Silver Star, and a number of foreign decorations including the Croix de Guerre with palm from France.

The following editorial from the San Antonio Express of January 18, 1966, very aptly describes the superb service that the late General Hodges has rendered to the people of this country:

GENERAL HODGES' SUPERB SERVICE

The names of Remagen Bridge, Aachen, the Hurtgen Forest, and "the Bulge" flashed back across the years this week in millions of minds at the news of the death of a distinguished American citizen and a superb general, Courtney Hicks Hodges.

General Hodges was an unassuming man but a man with almost boundless confidence rooted in competence. He commanded the U.S. 1st Army in its dramatic sweep across Europe during World War II. His commander, Gen. Omar Bradley of the wartime 12th Army Group, said of General Hodges that he was "essentially a military technician whose faultless technique and tactical knowledge made him one of the most skilled craftsmen of my entire command. He probably knew as much about infantry and training as any man in the Army."

The general was a career soldier, a veteran of both World Wars and holder of numerous medals, including the Distinguished Service Medal with two clusters and the Silver and the Bronze Stars, the latter two awarded for personal gallantry and bravery.

As a San Antonio citizen since 1949, he won widespread affection and admiration among this community's residents. Mrs. Hodges and other members of his family can take comfort in knowing that he served his country to the limits of his enormous capacity and that his countrymen and the free world is grateful for it.

Constance Baker Motley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at President Johnson's selection of Mrs. Constance Baker Motley, for a seat on the Federal bench in the State of New York. Mrs. Motley, as you know, has been a dedicated responsible leader of the civil rights movement for many years. She has carried the fight for Negro rights into courts throughout the land and she has, by the brilliance of her mind as well as by her stunning presence, won the respect of friend and adversary. As president of the Borough of Manhattan she showed a capacity for administration and a profound understanding of social problems. Mrs. Motley's qualifications for a Federal judgeship are many, but perhaps the most important is that she is a magnificent lawyer, with a deep and sensitive feeling for the meaning of the law. The Federal judiciary will be richer for her presence.

I congratulate Mrs. Motley and I commend the President on this superb appointment.

Daniel Sullivan, Justice, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished resident and a neighbor of mine, Justice Daniel Sullivan, died a few weeks ago. While we did not always agree on political questions, I always respected Justice Sullivan as a man profoundiy convinced of the rightness of his convictions.

Under unanimous consent I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief biography of this longtime public servant:

[From the N.Y. Times, Jan. 8, 1966]

DANIEL SULLIVAN, PROSECUTOR, DIES—EX-BRONX DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND CITY COURT JUSTICE, 79

SARANAC LAKE, N.Y., January 8.—Daniel V. Sullivan, District Attorney of Bronx County from 1955 to 1960, died today in Saranac Lake General Hospital. He was 79 years old and lived at 1 River Crest Road in Riverdale, the Bronx.

Mr. Sullivan was a justice of the city court designated by the appellate division to sit on the State supreme court bench when he was named by Gov. W. Averrel Harriman to the Bronx County post. He succeeded George B. DeLuca, who became Lieutenant Governor. Later in 1955 Mr. Sullivan was elected to a full 4-year term.

Mr. Sullivan led a vigorous fight against juvenile delinquency in the Bronx and investigated a practice in which defective television tubes were reprocessed illegally and brand names were forged.

Before becoming District Attorney he had served in the city court for 4 years, and in the municipal court for 16.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE SECRETARY

After his retirement in 1960, Mr. Sullivan became a consultant to the New York law firm of Barry, Treanor, Shandell & Zachary and a director of the Security Mutual Insurance Company of New York.

A lifelong Democrat, he served as secretary of the electoral college after 1960. He was a delegate to the 1960 and 1964 national conventions.

Mr. Sullivan was born in New York and was graduated from the New York Law School in 1910. After establishing a law practice in New York, he became secretary to the State Supreme Court Justice John E. McGeehan in 1934. That year he was named to fill a vacancy in the municipal court.

He was a past president of the Fordham Alumni Sodality, a life member of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, a fourth degree Knight of Columbus and a member of the Royal Arcanum. For 53 consecutive years Mr. Sullivan had been a retreatant at the Jesuit House of Mount Manresa on Staten Island.

Surviving are his widow, the former Marie Antoinette Clermont, and a brother, Leo M. Sullivan, of Linden, N.J.

A requiem mass will be celebrated on Wednesday morning at St. Philip Neri Roman Catholic Church, 3025 Grand Concourse, the Bronx.

University of Michigan: An Education for Excellence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WESTON E. VIVIAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the University of Michigan, located in Ann Arbor, in the Second Congressional District, which I am privileged to represent in this distinguished body, has been the recipient of more than its share of honors and recognition, during almost 150 years of distinguished service to the people of its State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the University of Michigan currently serves our country in many ways. Scientific and technological research performed at the university currently amounts to over $40 million annually, much of it done under grants and contracts from the Federal Government. Michigan's distinguished graduates occupy positions in the top echelons of government, including several Members of the U.S. Senate and of this body, and a number of important posts in the executive branch.

In the December 1965 edition of America magazine, a Russian language publication of the U.S. Information Agency widely distributed in the Soviet Union, one of the featured articles was entitled, in translation, "University of Michigan: Education for Excellence." The article was liberally illustrated with photographs by the distinguished American photographer, Alfred Eisenstadt.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today the English translation of the text of the article:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN: AN EDUCATION FOR EXCELLENCE

Snow blanketed or sun dappled, the University of Michigan is an impressive sight. Sprawled across more than 2,000 acres in and around Ann Arbor, its facilities rank with the world's finest. But the school's prominence goes beyond that. Like the great campus itself, intellectual life spreads far and wide, into every facet of the mind, every corner of the world.

Here, noted scholars lend their wisdom to eager young minds, world-renowned composers perform and create, and researchers probe the secrets of science. Of its 17 schools, 2 are especially well known: the law school and the music school. Both are examples of Michigan's use of specially designed classrooms. The law school has an authentic courtroom presided over by experienced judges. The music building boasts two organ rooms and a rehearsal hall large enough to hold the university's symphony orchestra or the 206-piece marching band.

Standing on the campus today, one would not guess that Michigan, which opened its doors in 1841, is among the oldest U.S. universities. New buildings and residences are constantly being built to accommodate the freshmen who storm the gates each fall. (Total enrollment this year is more than 30,000.) But physical expansion, continuing by leaps and bounds, hasn't diluted the school's quality. The University of Michigan continues to be an outstanding example of vastness-cum-excellence.

FIRST-RATE FACILITIES EASE THE TEACHING TASK

Michigan may be one of the oldest schools in America, but it's far from being old fashioned. In order to handle the tidal wave of students and yet maintain standards of excellence, the university has embraced electronic teaching aids on a wide scale. The medical school, with 4 color and 11 black-and-white cameras, is noted for having the largest television installation of any U.S. medical school. In the department of education, student teachers can observe on TV the methods of instructors conducting classes nearby. Similarly, law school students have the proceedings in a local court piped into their classroom via closed-circuit TV.

In the language labs, one can dial directly for any of 432 taped lessons in 22 languages. Not only in electronics, but in many fields of science and technology, Michigan stays in the forefront. With its laboratories, hospital, aquarium, and other facilities, the university is a valuable center of research.

LOOKING ON THE LIGHTER SIDE

"Enjoy yourself, it's later than you think," says the song, and students at Michigan take this advice. Concerts, plays, sports, and songfests fill their leisure hours. The giant campus bursts with so much culture that one student from New York marveled, "Where else, unless I just stay home in Manhattan, can I hear as many different kinds of music, see as many plays, look at so much painting?" There's plenty to cheer about on the athletic fields, too, for year after year Michigan's teams rank with the Nation's leaders. And for those not content to be spectators, there is a wide variety of sports such as tennis, archery and hockey. But the most common form of relaxation can also be the most enjoyable—those satisfying gabfests shared with friends.

Congratulations to Paul A. Miltich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. MACKIE
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 13, 1966

Mr. MACKIE. Mr. Speaker, Paul A. Miltich, a correspondent for the Booth newspapers of Michigan, has been elected to membership on the standing committee of correspondents.

Paul's election victory—he received the highest number of votes cast—indicates he is held in high esteem by his colleagues.

We join other members of the Michigan delegation in congratulating Paul Miltich in his victory and he has our best wishes for a successful term of office.

Quiet Solution to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a number of letters asking, "When are we going to win the war in Vietnam, and why not?" Some of them say no more than this. I have replied to these letters with the request that they advise me where they are obtaining their "canned" question, but to date have not had a response.

I have advised these people that their question was hostile and by implication misreads the intentions of the United States as enunciated by our President and by Secretary of State Rusk. Furthermore, I have pointed out to them that exceptionally skilled and capable students of foreign affairs have indicated the complexities of the problem with which we are faced. I feel that these questioners should know of the relationship of our difficulties in Vietnam with the problems elsewhere in the world.

An article by George Kennan, widely respected for his astuteness in foreign affairs, clearly points out this interrelationship. I commend it to my colleagues, and ask permission that it be inserted following my remarks.

QUIET SOLUTION TO VIETNAM: U.S. EXPERT ON COMMUNISM CITES FUTILITY OF FURTHER ESCALATION

(By George F. Kennan)

(NOTE.—Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, Kennan is an authority on world communism.)

There are, I am sure, many besides myself who would have preferred to remain silent in the face of a discussion so shrill and confused as that which has revolved around the Vietnam problem in recent months.

But the challenge advanced a few days ago by the Freedom House statement, "Placing the onus on those who remain silent and fail to make clear the American consensus," is a fair one and its authors can have no complaint if it is responded to, in this instance, by one whose voice not all of them always hear with sympathy.

Our adversaries in Vietnam are people for whose predilections and purposes no one in this country need have the faintest sympathy. Allowed to have their way, they would impose a ruthless dictatorship in any area under their control; and the experience of other Communist countries (leaving aside, for the moment, Yugoslavia) does not suggest that this would be followed by economic or social benefits remotely commensurate with the loss of liberty and the isolation from the world community this tyranny would involve.

DEMONSTRATORS' INTENT

The young Americans who march around with Vietcong flags or profess to favor a Vietcong victory are choosing a very strange way to demonstrate an attachment to the cause of either independence or freedom, if this is indeed what they are interested in.

On the other hand, to recognize that this is so does not mean that is necessarily the duty of the United States of America to set all this to rights. Understanding of democratic ideals it not widely spread among the human race. There are more instances of oppression and of the abuse of power in this world than the United States alone can ever hope to remedy, and some of them are closer to home than Vietnam.

Nor is it clear that such Vietnamese as we might find to install in power in the unlikely event of a sweeping military success (for surely who would not wish to hold the country indefinitely under direct colonial administration) would be inclined, or even able, to rule with any markedly greater liberality.

TWO QUESTIONS

The questions we have really to ask ourselves when we think of the future of Vietnam are primarily two: first, to what extent a future Vietnamese regime would be likely to accept a status of subordination to one of the two great Communist states and to represent an extention of its political and strategic power; and secondly, what would be the effect of the settlement on the neighboring areas.

As to the first of these questions: It is unlikely, in the face of the Chinese-Soviet conflict, that even a Communist regime in any part of Vietnam would find it necessary or desirable, in normal circumstances, to subordinate itself entirely to either of the two great Communist powers. If Hanoi has today come into a one-sided and unhealthy relationship of dependence on Peiping, this is surely primarily the effect of the discipline exerted by the war itself. In the event of a termination of hostilities, there would be neither necessity nor advantage from the North Vietnamese standpoint in retaining a wholly one-sided alinement. But for a smaller Communist country to attempt to preserve a balance in the relationship to the two great ones means, as we see from other examples, to exercise a high degree of independence in external relations generally.

Thus even in the event of a complete Vietcong victory (and I am not suggesting we settle for anything of this sort), the result would probably be something less than the automatic extension of Chinese power that many of us fear.

As to the second question, that of the reaction of other countries: This is of course a very serious consideration. Our Government is justified in citing it as a main reason why we could not contemplate any precipitate and disorderly withdrawal. But the elements of this "third country" problem have undergone important alteration as a result of recent events in Indonesia and probably in India and Pakistan as well. One wonders whether these changes have been fully taken into account. Our latitude of action would seem to be greater than it was when we first committed our forces to action in Vietnam on a serious scale.

DISBALANCED POLICIES

The most disturbing aspect of our involvement in Vietnam is its relationship to our interests and responsibilities in other areas of world affairs. Whatever justification this involvement might have had if Vietnam had been the only important problem, or even the outstanding problem, we faced in this world today, this not being the case, its present dimensions can only be said to represent a grievous disbalance of American policy.

For nearly a year now we have sacrificed to this effort all serious possibility for improvement of our relations with the Soviet Union, with all this implies from the standpoint of the ultimate danger of nuclear war; and this we have done at a time when prospects for such improvement were otherwise not unfavorable. We have placed a great and deeply regrettable strain on the friendship and confidence of the Japanese people. A pall of discouragement has been cast over those responsible for the conduct of the United Nations. Constructive treatment of the great problems of Germany, of nuclear disarmament, of the future of the United Nations, and of China in the wider sense has everywhere been placed largely in abeyance, in deference to this one remote involvement.

All of these problems are more important, for the long term, than what happens in Vietnam; and there is none of them that will be usefully met even by such further military successes as we may have in the Vietnam area—rather the contrary.

UNFORTUNATE CONCENTRATION

The effects of this unbalanced concentration of resources and attention on a single area of world affairs are unfortunate enough even as things stand today. They could be much more unfortunate if we were to be suddenly faced, as we easily could be, with a simultaneous crisis in another area where our interests are importantly engaged.

This being so, if we can now find nothing better to do than to embark upon a further open-ended increase in the level of our commitment, simply because the alternatives seem humiliating and frustrating, one will have to ask whether we have not become enslaved to the dynamics of a single unmanageable situation—to the point where we have lost much of the power of initiative and control over our own policy, not just locally but on a world scale.

None of this should be taken as inferring that our Government has been guilty of obvious stupidities. At no time in the history of this whole unhappy affair have its choices been easy or obvious ones; and the worst feature of the many violent demonstrations of opinion in this country, pro and con, has been that they have so vehemently suggested that they have been. Questions about past decisions, furthermore, are not answers to the problem we face at this particular moment.

On the other hand, it will not do for the administration simply to turn to its critics outside Government and say: "What would you suggest?" No one who is not privy to all the available information and who cannot give a large proportion of his time to the study of public questions could make useful suggestions for specific action in a situation so vastly complicated as this.

The administration could perhaps get more help from public discussion if it could find less exalted and more meaningful terms in which to describe its own predicament. Public understanding is not aided by the demands that the North Vietnamese cease their aggression which fall so regularly from the lips of senior State Department officials. We are not dealing here with established sovereign states. The situation does not lend itself to classification under established concepts of international law.

Nor does it help us much to be told that our Government is determined "to live up to our commitments." Commitments to whom? To some South Vietnamese Government? If so, to which one? When and where did we assume the obligation to sacrifice to its defense the whole balance of our policy and the wider interests of world peace? And is this commitment conceived as something related to its own performance, to its own ability to command the confidence of its people? Or is it the people of Vietnam themselves to whom this commitment is conceived to relate?

NEGOTIATION OUT

Obviously, there feelings cannot today be consulted in any orderly way; but can we be sure, on the basis of what we now know of their reactions, that to have this conflict continue to be fought out on their backs is really preferable in their eyes to the consequences of even the most unfortunate political settlement?

If, in short, what we are actually fighting over is the preservation of some balance of power in that part of the world, which is something about which we have every right to be concerned, let us then discuss the problem in those terms and not try to drape our action in legalisms and moralisms.

No one can question the thesis that a precipitate withdrawal, representing the total capitulation of our entire position in that region, would be one of the worst of the alternatives before us. No one will deny that the other side is today wholly unresponsive to any and all suggestions for negotiation—particularly negotiation with us. I wonder, however, whether negotiation—particularly early negotiation between Hanoi and ourselves—is the only, or even the most promising, way out of this situation. Prospects were never good, at any time, for agreement between the North Vietnamese and ourselves on any sort of publicly-negotiated, formal contract, defining what political conditions should henceforth prevail in the disputed area. Hanoi cannot join us, the "imperialists," in publicly instructing the Vietcong, partially a South Vietnamese force, to be politically unsuccessful.

ARBITRATOR NEEDED

There would be a better chance of this situation's simmering down, through a series of reciprocal unilateral actions on the part of the main protagonists, to a point where it becomes somehow manageable, as so many other tense situations have done in recent years, than of its being resolved by contractual agreement between ourselves and one portion of the other side. If we wish to develop this possibility of a simmering-down (and it is, unhappily, the most promising of all the possibilities we face) then we must be prepared, it would seem, to let the talking be done for us, quite privately and without elbow-jogging on our part, by our friends and others who have an interest in the termination of the conflict; and then we must be prepared, depending on such advice as we receive from them, to place limited restraints at some point on our military efforts, and to do so quietly, without published time limits or ultimata, where we have reason to hope such restraints will meet with adequate reciprocation from the other side.

NO GUARANTEE

No one can guarantee the success of this approach; and there are many who, in the light of the pretentious terms in which our objectives have often been cast, would consider it inadequate even if successful. But is is hard to imagine anything better. I would not know what "victory" means in these conditions. In this sort of a war, one controls what one can take and hold and police with ground force; one does not control what one bombs.

And it seems to me the most unlikely of all contingencies that anyone should come to us on his knees and inquire our terms whatever the escalation of our effort. If it be once accepted that in the present difficult situation the security of our own forces is the cardinal consideration, that it is better to hold smaller areas securely than to hold larger ones insecurely and that immediate objective is not to bring the adversary to the negotiating table but to bring about a mutual lowering of the intensity of hostilities, then perhaps the advantages and disadvantages of such an approach will appear in a different light.

Ukrainian Independence Day

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, the Ukrainian Americans in my State celebrated the 48th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine. On that day, in 1918, the Ukrainian Rada, or Parliament, proclaimed Ukraine's independence. The Ukrainian declaration of independence was called the Fourth Universal. Although the Ukrainians had taken advantage of the Russian revolution to proclaim their independence, they soon found that the new masters of the Kremlin were no more willing than the czars to allow them their right of self-determination. For 2 gallant years the Ukrainian patriots held out against the superior numerical strength of the Bolsheviks. But although the Soviets finally conquered the Ukrainian land they could not win the allegiance of the freedom-loving Ukrainians.

Peasant uprisings continued long after the Red army had occupied the Ukraine. During the Second World War Ukrainian patriots organized against both the Nazis and the Soviets. Even today stories of opposition to Soviet rule reach Ukrainian Americans.

I am sure I speak for the Congress and the American people when I reaffirm my dedication to the cause of independence for the Ukraine. For the American people, Mr. Speaker, have always believed deeply in the self-determination of all nations. As the Ukrainian experience clearly demonstrates, the fires of freedom are not only unquenchable, in our shrinking world they are also indivisible.

Address by Harold L. Tweedy Favoring Federal Charters for Mutual Savings Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I learned today that President Johnson in his Economic Report has urged the enactment of legislation to provide Federal charters for mutual savings banks.

I have introduced legislation to accomplish this for many years and I hope that during the current session we will see this proposal enacted into law.

An increasing number of savings and loan associations favor Federal charters for mutual savings banks, and in an address to the 19th midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks on December 14, 1965, Harold L. Tweedy, president of the First Federal Savings and Loan Association of Pittsburgh spoke of the reasons for this favorable attitude.

I commend Mr. Tweedy's address to the attention of our colleagues:

WHY AN INCREASING NUMBER OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS FAVOR FEDERAL CHARTERS FOR MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

(Address by Harold L. Tweedy, president, First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Pittsburgh, presented at the 19th midyear meeting of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, December 14, 1965, New York City)

In the last year or two I have had the privilege of exchanging ideas on the subject of Federal charters for mutual savings banks with fellow savings and loan managers in different parts of the country. My distinct impression is that there is a growing understanding of the fundamental issues involved and their critical nature with respect to the future of the savings and loan business.

On the one hand there is deep concern over preservation of our basically mutual image. On the other there is strong opinion favorable to the stock form of capital organization. In some quarters, unfortunately, there is opposition to the effort you are making to obtain Federal charters for mutual savings banks.

Moreover, and this is especially disturbing to a last-ditch mutual proponent like myself, pressure is developing for legislation authorizing the chartering of stock Federal savings and loan associations.

Candidly, as I look at my business today I see distinct evidences of split personality.

The savings and loan business has been rolling along under a full head of steam since the end of World War II. But in my conversations with other managers I sense an increasing appreciation of the fact that we are approaching a critical juncture with respect to the kind of institutions we want to be in the future. And, as we ponder this question, I believe that a substantial and growing number of savings and loan people are becoming convinced that provision should be made for the Federal chartering of mutual savings banks. I believe I may fairly summarize this thinking in the following manner:

FIRST OF ALL, WE BELIEVE THAT THE MUTUAL FORM OF ORGANIZATION IS BEST FOR SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

Fundamentally, for an institution which deals exclusively in the savings accumulations of the public, and especially people of modest means, the stewardship principle seems to us to be superior to ownership of the institution by one person or a small group standing to make money out of the enterprise.

I want to emphasize that we have nothing against the old line stock savings and loan associations as they were known in years gone by and still are known in States like Ohio and some others. What we do object to, and strenuously, is the exploitation of the good name of the savings and loan business through conversion of mutual associations to the stock form by people who have little regard for the fine traditions of our business and who are motivated essentially by the pursuit of a fast buck.

On this matter of making money, I want to avoid being misunderstood. While I don't think it is appropriate to have savings institutions bought and sold for personal profit by means of the stock device, this does not mean that I regard the mutual form of organization as inimicable to the profit motive. You know and I know that in the operation of mutual savings institutions most of us are highly profit oriented. We have to be if we are to survive. The only difference is that instead of striving for profits for a relatively small owning group we are striving for profits which will be distributed on a broad base to the entire body of savings account holders of our institutions.

All of this is not just pure idealism. As managers of mutual institutions you and I are not so dedicated that we are prepared to work for nothing. I think the record will show that the typical profit oriented mutual savings institution can and does compensate management in a reasonably generous manner and that adequate compensation and financial reward in our field is not dependent upon the holding of an equity interest.

THE SAVINGS BANKS OF THE COUNTRY APPEAR TO BE THE BULWARK OF MUTUALITY IN THE SAVINGS FIELD

Since our commercial banking friends some years ago reached the conclusion that savings deposits once again are desirable and therefore deserving of a fair rate of return, this segment of the savings field has developed rapidly. It is of course strictly nonmutual in character.

Among savings and loan associations, the trend as I already have indicated has been rather strongly toward the stock form of organization and away from mutuality. This is true insofar as numbers and assets are concerned and it is true insofar as geographic spread is concerned.

As I suspect you may know, there are only a handful of State chartered savings and loan associations left in California which are not of the stock type. Moreover this form of organization has spread persistently into other States which previously were exclusively mutual.

An illustration is the State of Illinois which until only a few years ago was strictly mutual as to savings and loan associations and which today has some 75 stock type institutions. Looking over the savings and loan problems in Cook County with which they have been called upon to deal in the recent past, I would think that the Illinois supervisory authorities might view this trend toward stock type associations with somewhat mixed emotions.

In the savings field among major types of thrift institutions, it is only the savings banks that display a clear disposition to preserve and nourish the mutual principle exclusively.

Of course I have to recognize that this situation could very well prove illusory. That is to say, the idea of conversion to stock type banks could germinate and grow within your business as it has in mine. We are prepared to gamble that this won't happen.

In that connection, one of the things which I find particularly admirable in the pending Federal savings bank bill is the 10-year prohibition against conversion of a Federal savings bank to a nonmutual type of institution. It seems to me that without discernible detriment to the financial structure of the country this prohibition could be increased from 10 years to 100 years.

AN OPEN ROAD TO CONVERSION IS ESSENTIAL

To those of us who feel that the mutual form of organization is best for savings institutions and who see the mutual bank system as the principal bulwark of mutuality in the savings field, it is more important that the avenue of conversion from a savings and loan to a Federal mutual savings bank be made available. With the passage of the Federal savings bank bill there would be open to savings and loan associations which wish to remain clearly identified with the mutual principle, an escape route, if you please, to be used in the event the savings and loan business continues to go increasingly stock and comes increasingly under the stock image in the public mind.

I am not prepared to say to you—as A. D. Theobald did 2 years ago and as some others in the savings and loan business have said point blank with respect to their institutions—that First Federal of Pittsburgh would immediately convert to a Federal savings bank once the pending bill is approved. But I cannot emphasize too strongly that we want that route open to us. I trust that my support of your efforts on these terms will be acceptable. After all, you already have a number of fine, substantial savings banks in Pennsylvania.

Although I think it has received more emphasis than is warranted by the facts, it nevertheless is true that for us in the savings and loan business conversion does hold a measure of appeal from the standpoint of terminology. The term "bank" probably is a little more prestigious and certainly a whole lot shorter and easier for the public to use than the term "savings and loan association."

In the last analysis, the term "Federal savings bank" is about as descriptive and succinct as it possibly could be. It emphasizes all of the main things we want to convey to the public. Each word tells its own story: Federal, savings, bank.

Another major consideration is the high esteem in which savings banks are held by the public. This grows out of your long and honorable history, the high quality of stewardship which has characterized the conduct of your business, the generally large size achieved by individual institutions and their exceptionally favorable record during the depression. I am not sure that all of this glory would rub off on a newly converted institution but it is a factor which does have appreciable weight.

Finally, there is the matter of broad powers. Savings and loan associations, like mutual savings banks, want to be the bank for the man in the street, for John Q. Public. They want to be able to offer a full range of related services for the individual—as distinguished from financial service to commerce and industry which, as their name implies, is the province of commercial banks.

Considering the historic authorizations granted savings banks along these lines of service to the individual, the important precedents established in many savings bank States and their deeply rooted status as banks, it is argued by many that this broadening of opportunity for financial service to the individual can most effectively be made available to savings and loan associations via the route of conversion to Federal savings banks. Here in this new form of Federal banks for people, the best of both our systems would be combined.

Believe it or not, there are those of us in the savings and loan business who feel that mutual savings banks are here to stay and that as a major part of the country's financial structure they are just as deserving as any other type of banking institution of the benefits of a dual system of charters.

I know you have been somewhat painfully reminded that there have been occasions in the past when savings banks might readily have obtained Federal charter legislation. But those who were then calling the turn for you did not choose to move in that direction. Nevertheless, in the eyes of many of us in the savings and loan business this is water long since over the dam. The fact is that a dual system of Federal and State charters would be good for the savings banks, would be in the public interest and in all fairness it ought to be made available to you.

Some people in the savings and loan business are under the misapprehension that the passage of Federal savings bank legislation would create additional competition for them. Those of us who favor such legislation believe that this concern is not justified.

If a savings and loan association were to convert to a Federal savings bank no new institution would be added that wasn't there before. As to the chartering of additional newly organized Federal savings banks, the pending legislation provides that no new charter may be issued in the absence of a clear showing that the locality in question stands in need of additional services. Thus no greater threat lies in the possibility of the establishment of new Federal savings banks than already exists with respect to the establishment of new Federal savings and loan associations or State chartered institutions of either type.

We believe the day is coming closer, and coming closer rapidly, when the mutual savings and loan associations and the mutual savings banks must and will be drawn together into a single great thrift system.

As far as a growing number of us are concerned, the quicker this happens the better. We believe the trend is inevitable and that it should be accelerated by provision of Federal charters for savings banks now.

We feel that the objective of bringing the two systems together is more important than any question of relative advantage. That is, we feel it is more important to bring the two systems together than to be overly concerned, for example, about the name of the ultimate institution or the surviving trade association. The technical differences between our institutions are of no real significance, our ideals and objectives are identical and yet we are not united in our approach to the public nor in our defense against those who would injure or destroy us.

From the standpoint of the public interest and the well being of the mutual savings business as a whole, the important thing is to get behind the consolidation effort and move it forward. We feel that the proposed chartering and supervision of Federal savings banks through the Federal Home Loan Bank Board which has responsibility for Federal savings and loan associations can only result in a closer tie and an easier transition to a single system.

In the interim, while we are working together toward this goal of ultimate unification of our systems, there are a number of areas where it seems to me we can profitably continue and in fact should increase the degree of our collaboration.

Obviously, we should continue to stand shoulder to shoulder with respect to equitable tax treatment by the Federal Government. In this area we have collaborated effectively in the past and there is nothing in the existing attitude of the commercial banks to suggest any lessening of need for continued joint action between us.

As you are aware, there is a relatively new organization on the scene, known as the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions and headquartered here in New York, which has been working actively in conjunction with your own national trade association, both in the tailoring of the proposed Federal savings bank charter and in shaping up joint positions on matters of mutual interest. Recent events lead me to hope that it may be possible to develop further the Council of Mutual Savings Institutions and increase its effectiveness as a vehicle for joint action.

Federal Home Loan Bank membership is another most important area where we have an opportunity to further our common objectives. The number of savings bank members in the Federal Home Loan Bank System has increased from 33 in 1962 to 47 at the present time, or by 40 percent.

I am happy to say that in my own neck of the woods, the first of Pennsylvania's seven mutual savings banks last year became affiliated with the Federal Home Loan Bank of Pittsburgh. Nothing would please me more than to see the remaining six also join the Bank and I think it would be advantageous from both our points of view were they to do so.

There are many persuasive reasons why savings banks that want to see passage of the Federal charter bill should affiliate with the Federal Home Loan Bank System. In particular, I invite your thoughtful consideration of these four points:

The Bank System provides a dependable secondary liquidity reserve which enables a member institution to invest a higher proportion of its assets in mortgages than would otherwise be prudent. This means just one thing—higher earnings.

The Bank System offers a dependable source of long-term funds for relending purposes. Used within conservative limits, this again means just one thing—increased earning power for your institution.

The Bank System affords an excellent meeting ground on which all of us can become better acquainted, exchange ideas, and work toward the realization of our common goals.

The clincher is the strong representation you have on the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the fact that the Board is actively supporting your Federal charter effort.

As you know, the cost of membership in the bank system is measured simply in terms of the required stock investment. This is a small price to pay for the advantages just itemized.

Just before I left Pittsburgh to come to this meeting I received advice that the current dividend on our Federal home loan bank stock had been declared at the rate of 3⅞ percent per annum.

The largest mutual savings bank in the country, the Bowery Savings Bank here in New York City, became a member of the Federal home loan bank of New York something over 2 years ago. Both it and the Federal Home Loan Bank System seem to have withstood the shock and are doing quite nicely.

For all of the reasons I have touched on, but especially because of the help it can be in your Federal chartering effort, I think that each of your institutions should take up this matter of Federal home loan bank membership and act on it now, rather than putting it off for later consideration as perhaps many of your institutions have been doing. You have strong enemies. I think you ought to be standing shoulder to shoulder with your friends.

An additional area where we can collaborate to advantage is through participation in our respective educational organizations. At First Federal of Pittsburgh one of our key officers has completed the savings banks' management development program at Dartmouth and by next summer another of our vice presidents also will have graduated. In addition, one of our loan officers this year completed both sections of the NAMSB mortgage clinic conducted at Meriden, Conn. The more of this sort of thing we can encourage, the more closely our people and our systems will be drawn together.

Finally, let me remind you of the opportunities we have for collaboration in the public relations field, particularly as a result of the action taken this year by the Financial Public Relations Association, to close the door to any new savings and loan association members. This as you know, had the inevitable consequence of causing us to form our own organization—the Savings Institutions Marketing Society of America. I think it behooves all of us to support this new and lively organization. Membership in SIMSA is inexpensive and the possibilities for effective collaboration far reaching.

In conclusion, I want to go on record with the unequivocal prediction that you will be successful in your efforts to obtain Federal savings bank legislation, and that in attaining this goal you will be strongly supported by a not inconsiderable number of savings and loan associations. Next year will be the 150th anniversary of the establishment of mutual savings banking in this country and I hope that, appropriately enough, this will be the year in which your long battle will be won.

Iron-Fisted Notice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the administration seems intent on killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. In its haste to socialize the world, it is killing the American free enterprise system. A brief but most pertinent editorial comment on this fact appeared in the Thursday, January 20 edition of the Lansing Journal of Lansing, Ill., and I insert it in the Record at this point:

IRON-FISTED NOTICE

It is alarming to read man-in-the-street interviews and find most of the public agreeing with President Johnson's interference in industry.

In effect today is one-man price control. It has not been established by acts of Congress. It is not practiced as a war measure. Whatever else it is, it is a spectacular exercise to the vast power of the White House. It is the iron-fisted notice that industry in the United States is the pawn of the Government of the United States.

Our great Nation was built on the principles of free enterprise and that a government which governs the least is the best government. These two great heritages are rapidly vanishing from the American scene. There is very little free enterprise today amid overwhelming Government oppression.

Agriculture in Developing Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, today, the Honorable Lynn Stalbaum, of Wisconsin, my colleague, has introduced legislation to encourage improved methods of agriculture in the developing countries. I congratulate him and heartily endorse his efforts.

The world faces a situation of dire emergency in regard to the feeding of all its people. The United States has for so long been able to send its surpluses abroad that it is hard to understand that these surpluses are all but depleted.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture says that if we "bring into production all cropland now diverted to nonproductive uses through acreage diversion programs we could produce an additional 40 million tons of grain in addition to the 175 million tons now being produced per year."

Prior to World War II the underdeveloped regions of Africa, Asia, and Latin America exported 11 million tons of grain per year to the developed regions, principally Western Europe. By 1964 these regions were importing grain at the rate of 25 million tons annually from the developed regions, largely North America. This flow of grain from the "haves" to the "have-nots" is expected to rise even more rapidly in the years just ahead.

Simple arithmetic exposes the fallacy of relying on increased U.S. food production alone. We cannot make up the world food deficit. It is imperative that farmers the world over be helped to improve their methods and yields. No less important is it that family planning information and programs be given strong support.

Birth rates are rising at a rapid pace in the parts of the world which cannot feed its present populations. All programs of help to these countries must incorporate population control advice—else, instead of being helpful benefactors we will have come only to give false promises and to encourage false hopes.

Another Big Lie Nailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRENTISS WALKER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. WALKER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my State of Mississippi, along with many of her sister Staes, has in the past several years received much unwarranted public attention relating to so-called police brutality. The following editorial by my good friend, Mr. Erle Johnston, Jr., editor of the Scott County, Miss., Times, appeared in his paper on Wednesday, December 22, 1965. This editorial points out just one case where sensational charges of police brutality were never proven. But, the fact that no formal charges were ever brought forth by the Justice Department does not erase the libelous headlines that appeared in newspapers and on network television when the original claims were made.

I commend to my colleagues this honest expression of concern.

Another Big Lie Nailed

Last June, several hundred demonstrators picketing a special session of the Mississippi Legislature—which incidentally was revising registration and election laws—were arrested by Jackson police for parading without a permit and refusing orders to disperse.

During arrest and confinement at the Mississippi State Fairgrounds compound, they were under surveillance of civil rights attorneys, agents of the Justice Department, and national news media. There were no reports of brutality.

Then out of the blue, a three-man team from the National Council of Churches made an investigation of the compound and spent a total of 2 hours—by their own admission—interviewing the demonstrators.

The committee made an official report at a congressional briefing charging the Jackson police with Hitlerlike tactics, including "gassing" of prisoners, kicking pregnant women in the stomach, forcing prisoners to put their arms in boiling water, making women strip before policemen, unwarranted beatings, denying medical treatment, and depriving inmates of adequate food.

These charges shocked Mississippians and the efficient personnel of the Jackson Police Department, one of the best-trained and most conscientious in the Nation.

Jackson Mayor Allen Thompson denounced the charges as "pure falsehoods" and demanded a Presidential investigation to refute the statements. Mississippi Congressmen attacked the report as "vicious propaganda."

In the meantime, the northern press picked up the NCC report and made sensational headlines. Weeping Congressmen from other States made speeches for the Congressional Record, deploring brutality in Mississippi.

Prodded by the NCC committee, prisoners signed at least 70 affidavits against the Jackson Police Department.

It's now been nearly 6 months since the charges were publicized. It is well known that Federal authorities long ago completed their investigations. And not one single case against the police has been filed by the Justice Department.

The significance is apparent. Either the NCC committee was duped by lies from the prisoners or the committee deliberately conceived these distortions to smear Mississippi.

On prior occasions, the Justice Department—given sufficient evidence—has filed brutality charges against Mississippi law enforcement officers in at least three counties.

But despite the strong language of the NCC report, not a single affidavit against the Jackson police has merited legal action.

It would seem that a great injustice has been done to Jackson police and to Mississippi, now struggling with the problems of a transition period which has made the State a target for hate mongering.

In a recent article in U.S. News & World Report, FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover said that in 1965 his department investigated 1,787 allegations of police brutality in the United States with only 13 indictments returned against 23 officers. In 1964 there were 1,592 complaints and 16 indictments, and in 1963, over 1,300 charges and only 12 indictments.

Every State has its problems with defendants accusing law enforcement personnel of brutality when they are dutifully attempting to protect society.

The Jackson Police Department is due an apology.

Those guilty of distributing the stories—clergymen supposedly dedicated to truth and light—must make peace with their own consciences.

Federal Tax "Victim" Wants To Turn Tables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I noticed when reading the Washington Star of January 20, 1966, that Mr. D. J. Spensley, an Iowa businessman, has made a point that my Subcommittee on Census and Statistics has been trying to make for some time. Mr. Spensley is the operator of a drycleaning shop which employs 21 people, and he resents the endless hours he has to contribute to Federal paperwork. This is not unusual, but presenting the Internal Revenue Service with a bill for his services is. Mr. Spensley is attempting to charge the Federal Government for 800 hours of work at the rate of $3.75 an hour, the rate paid Internal Revenue Service collectors. Of course Mr. Spensley does not have a chance to collect, but he has made it abundantly clear that the time put in by citizens on Federal forms does cost money and is a burden to the business community.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I offer my congratulations to Mr. Spensley for his action and insert in the Record the article, "Federal Tax 'Victim' Wants To Turn Tables":

Federal Tax "Victim" Wants To Turn Tables

Des Moines, Iowa.—D. J. Spensley, an Iowa businessman, figures the Government owes him $3,000 for involuntary servitude. And he aims to collect.

The 61-year-old drycleaning shop owner at Waterloo is embarking on a crusade for himself and every other businessman who has to spend hours toiling over employee income tax withholding and social security forms.

"I resent being forced to collect money and make reports without compensation," said Spensley.

So the businessmen entered the district office of the U.S. Internal Revenue Service here yesterday and asked for $3,000.

He figures that's a conservative estimate of what he has coming for some 800 hours of work spent over the last 5 years computing and filing various Government forms for his 21 employees. He based it on the rate of $3.75 an hour paid to regular Internal Revenue Service collectors.

Spensley said he didn't really expect to triumph right away but hopes to encourage other employers to make the same demand. Eventually, he said, Congress may feel the pressure and do something about it.

Demonstration Cities Act of 1966

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation known as the Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 and which, as stated by the President in his message the other day, can make 1966 the year of rebuilding America's cities.

History already will record President Johnson as one of the truly great Presidents of this country. But I should like to add that with the enactment of his impressive program for rebuilding America's urban areas, Mr. Johnson will make one of the most significant contributions toward the growth of America in the second half of the 20th century.

The last census shows that more than 78 percent of the American population now lives in this Nation's urban communities. This 78 percent of the American population actually occupies less than 1 percent of America's entire land area.

With the advent of technological and industrial growth, there can be no question that America's large cities are the very heartbeat of this Nation.

We are today confidently predicting a $1 trillion gross national product by 1975; and the overwhelming majority of this tremendous industrial expansion will occur in our Nation's urban areas.

I can think of no single proposal brought before this Congress during the past decade which will have a greater impact on rebuilding the backbone of America than the legislation proposed by President Johnson and incorporated in this Demonstration Cities Act of 1966.

President Johnson quite properly stated that this Congress can set in motion forces of change in great urban areas that will make our cities the masterpieces of our civilization.

It is my fervent prayer that Congress will not delay in approving this legislation.

Let me hasten to make one thing crystal clear. This legislation is not just another slum clearance project designed to serve only the less fortunate.

This is a bold, imaginative, all-encompassing proposal to make the life of every person living in a large city—whether he lives in the slums or in the silk-stocking districts—be able to enjoy the full pleasures of urban life on the scale never imagined before.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district on the Northwest Side of Chicago which has the second highest per capita average income in the United States. My district for the most part is made of lovely homes and middle-income families. My district is far removed from the blighted areas of Chicago.

Yet, my constituents have as vital an interest in seeing that Chicago's depressed housing areas are eliminated as quickly as possible as the victims of this blight themselves.

For a large city cannot exist half prosperous, half slum; no more than the world can exist half slave and half free.

The homeowners of my community are now paying tremendously high real estate taxes only because large areas of Chicago are unable to carry their share of the load because of urban blight.

Aside from the moral obligation that we all have to eliminate blight, there is a material reward because as blight is removed and properties restored to the tax rolls the overall cost of Government is more equitably distributed.

My constituents can look forward to the day when we can hope for a significant further reduction in the crime rate in Chicago as we eliminate blight and let all families live in dignity and comfort.

By rebuilding these huge areas of blight in our cities, we can reduce the cost of fire protection, police protection, and all the other social services that are required today.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that by rebuilding on a massive scale all the aspects of these communities, we can reduce the tragic cost of public welfare in America. Certainly in this day and age there can no longer be any doubt in anyone's mind that blight and all the social ills associated with it breed poverty.

We in the State of Illinois alone spend $680 million every 24 months on the cost of public welfare.

In Cook County alone we are spending in excess of $18 million every 30 days for public welfare.

We are now spending $1.7 billion on a Federal antipoverty program.

We are spending another $1.5 billion for additional remedial education for children whose families are in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation proposed by President Johnson will do more to eliminate poverty in America than any other single piece of legislation ever approved in this country.

It has been properly said that when a Nation invests in a man it frees that man.

This modest proposal by President Johnson is the first step in helping give our cities the tools they need to eliminate blight and with it all the tragic circumstances and consequences that fester in areas of blight.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I confidently predicted that because of the dynamic antipoverty program now being carried on in Chicago, my city will be the first major city of the world to eliminate poverty.

No man in our generation has done more toward that goal than Chicago's mayor, Richard J. Daley.

I am confident that with the enactment of this additional legislation against poverty, Mayor Daley and the people of Chicago will make good our confidence that, indeed, Chicago shall become the first metropolis of the world free of blight and poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the legislation I introduced today follow:

H.R. 12343

A bill to assist city demonstration programs for rebuilding slum and blighted areas and for providing the public facilities and services necessary to improve the general welfare of the people who live in these areas

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Demonstration Cities Act of 1966".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that improving the quality of urban life is the most critical domestic problem facing the United States. The persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of persons of low income in older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and community facilities and services arising from rapid expansion of our urban population have resulted in a marked deterioration in the environment of large numbers of our people while the Nation as a whole prospers.

The Congress further finds and declares that cities, both large and small, do not have adequate resources to deal effectively with the critical problems facing them, and that additional Federal assistance is essential to enable cities to plan, develop, and conduct programs to improve their physical environment, increase their supply of adequate housing for low- and moderate-income people, and provide educational and social services vital to health and welfare.

It is the purpose of this Act to provide additional financial and technical assistance to enable cities, both large and small, to plan, develop, and carry out programs to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas and expand and improve public programs and services available to the people who live in such areas.

It is further the purpose of this Act to provide the additional financial aid needed to enable cities to participate more effectively in existing Federal assistance programs.

It is further the purpose of this Act to assist cities to coordinate activities aided under existing Federal programs with other public and private actions in order to provide the most effective and economical concentration of Federal, State, local, and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

BASIC AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make grants and provide technical assistance, as provided by this Act, to enable city demonstration agencies (as herein defined) to plan, develop, and carry out comprehensive city demonstration programs.

COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) A "comprehensive city demonstration program" is a locally prepared and scheduled program for rebuilding or restoring entire sections and neighborhoods of slum and blighted areas through the concentrated and coordinated use of all available Federal aids and local private and governmental resources, including citywide aids and resources necessary to improve the general welfare of the people living or working in the areas.

(b) A comprehensive city demonstration program is eligible for assistance under sections 6, 8, and 9 only if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the program is of sufficient magnitude in both physical and social dimensions (i) to remove or arrest blight and decay in entire sections or neighborhoods, (ii) to provide a substantial increase in the supply of standard housing of low and moderate cost, (iii) to make marked progress in serving the poor and disadvantaged people living in slum and blighted areas with a view to reducing educational disadvantages, disease, and enforced idleness, and (iv) to make a substantial impact on the sound development of the entire city;

(2) the rebuilding or restoration of sections or neighborhoods in accordance with the program will contribute to a well-balanced city with adequate public facilities (including those needed for transportation, education, and recreation), commercial facilities adequate to serve the residential areas, good access to industrial or other centers of employment, and housing for all income levels;

(3) the program provides for educational and social services necessary to serve the poor and disadvantaged in the area, widespread citizen participation in the program, maximum opportunities for employing residents of the area in all phases of the program, and enlarged opportunity for work and training;

(4) adequate local resources are, or will be, available for the completion of the program as scheduled;

(5) administrative machinery is available for carrying out the program on a consolidated and coordinated basis, the local governing body has approved the program, and local agencies whose cooperation is necessary to the success of the program have indicated their intent to furnish such cooperation.

(6) there exists a relocation plan meeting the requirements of the regulations referred to in section 9;

(7) the program is designed to assure maximum opportunity in the choice of housing accommodations by all citizens; and

(8) the program meets such additional requirements as the Secretary may establish to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) In making the determinations under subsection (b), the Secretary shall give maximum consideration to whether—

(1) substantive local laws, regulations, and other requirements are, or can be expected to be, consistent with the objectives of the program;

(2) the program will enhance neighborhoods by applying a high standard of design and will, as appropriate, maintain distinctive natural, historical, and cultural characteristics;

(3) the program is designed to make maximum use of new and improved technology and design, including cost reduction techniques;

(4) the program will encourage good community relations and counteract the segregation of housing by race or income; and

(5) the program is consistent with comprehensive planning for the entire urban or metropolitan area.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR PLANNING COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 90 per centum of the costs of planning and developing comprehensive city demonstration programs.

(b) Financial assistance will be provided under this section only if (1) the application for such assistance has been approved by the local governing body of the city, and (2) the Secretary has determined that there exist (i) administrative machinery through which coordination of all related planning activities of local agencies can be achieved and (ii) evidence that necessary cooperation of agencies engaged in related local planning can be obtained.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR APPROVED COMPREHENSIVE CITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 6. (a) The Secretary shall review plans for comprehensive city demonstration programs in order to determine that (1) such plans satisfy the criteria for such programs set forth in section 4, and (2) the various projects or activities to be undertaken in connection with such programs are scheduled to be initiated within a reasonably short period of time.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and to contract with, city demonstration agencies to pay 80 per centum of the costs of administering approved comprehensive city demonstration programs, but not the cost of administering any project or activity assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program.

(c) To assist the city to carry out the projects or activities included within an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, the Secretary is authorized to make grants to the city demonstration agency of not to exceed 80 per centum of the aggregate amount of non-Federal contributions otherwise required to be made to all projects or activities assisted by Federal grant-in-aid programs: *Provided*, That the amount of non-Federal contribution required for each project in a Federal grant-in-aid program shall be certified to the Secretary by the Federal department or agency (other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development) administering such program, and the Secretary shall accept such determination in computing the grants hereunder.

(d) Grant funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section may be used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of an approved comprehensive city demonstration program, or for other projects or activities undertaken as part of such demonstration program. If used for projects or activities assisted under a Federal grant-in-aid program which are undertaken as part of such demonstration program, funds provided pursuant to subsection (c) shall be credited as part or all of the required non-Federal contribution to such projects or activities.

(e) The Secretary shall not make any grant under this section unless he has obtained satisfactory assurances that the locality will maintain, during the period an approved comprehensive city demonstration program is being carried out, a level of aggregate expenditures for activities similar tc those being assisted under this section not less than the level of aggregate expenditures for such activities prior to initiation of the comprehensive city demonstration program.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR

SEC. 7. There shall be established for each locality having an approved comprehensive city demonstration program an office to be known as the office of the Federal coordinator headed by a director who shall be designated by the Secretary. The director shall perform such functions as the Secretary shall from time to time prescribe with respect to helping achieve the maximum effective coordination of Federal grant-in-aid programs undertaken in connection with comprehensive city demonstration programs. Nothing in this section shall be construed to vest in the Secretary any authority to exercise or delegate any function or duty vested by law in any department or agency of the Federal Government other than the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to undertake such activities as he determines to be desirable to provide, either directly or by contracts or other arrangements, technical assistance to city demonstration agencies to assist such agencies in planning, developing, and administering comprehensive city demonstration programs.

RELOCATION REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENTS

SEC. 9. (a) A comprehensive city demonstration program must include a plan for the relocation of individuals, families, business concerns, and nonprofit organizations displaced or to be displaced in carrying out the city demonstration program. The relocation plan shall be consistent with regulations prescribed by the Secretary to assure that (1) the provisions nad procedures included in the plan meet relocation standards equivalent to those prescribed under section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to urban renewal projects assisted under title I of that Act, and (2) relocation activities are coordinated to the maximum extent feasible with the increase in the supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families and individuals of low or moderate income, as provided under the comprehensive city demonstration program, or otherwise, in order to best maintain the available supply of such housing for all such families and individuals throughout the city.

(b) To the extent not otherwise authorized under any Federal law, financial assistance extended to a comprehensive city demonstration agency under section 6 shall include grants to cover the full cost of relocation payments, as herein defined. Such grants shall be in addition to other financial assistance extended to such agency under section 6.

The term "relocation payments" means payments by a comprehensive city demonstration agency to a displaced individual, family, business concern, or nonprofit organization which are made on such terms and conditions and subject to such limitations (to the extent applicable, but not including the date of displacement) as are provided for relocation payments, at the time such payments are approved, by section 114 (b), (c), (d), and (e) of the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to projects assisted under title I thereof.

(c) Subsection (b) shall not be applicable with respect to any displacement occurring prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONTINUED AVAILABILITY OF FEDERAL GRANT-IN-AIL PROGRAM

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unless hereafter enacted expressly in limitation of the provisions of this section, funds appropriated for a Federal grant-in-aid program which are reserved for any projects or activities assisted under such grant-in-aid program undertaken in connection with an approved comprehensive city demonstration program shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

CONSULTATION

SEC. 11. In carrying out the provisions of this Act, including the issuance of regulations, the Secretary shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Secretary shall consult with each Federal department and agency affected by each comprehensive city demonstration program before entering into a commitment to make grants for such program under section 6.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended when so provided in appropriation acts.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 13. As used in this Act—

(a) "Federal grant-in-aid program" means a program of Federal financial assistance other than loans and other than the assistance provided by this Act.

(b) "City demonstration agency" means the city or any local public agency established or designated by the local governing body to administer the comprehensive city demonstration program.

(c) "City" means any municipality (or two or more municipalities acting jointly) or, with respect to urban areas outside of incorporated municipalities, any county or other public body (or two or more acting jointly) having general governmental powers.

(d) "Local" agencies include State agencies and instrumentalities providing services or resources to a city or locality, and "local" resources include those provided to a city or locality by a State or its agency or instrumentality.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 14. (a) This Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1971: *Provided*, That the functions, powers, duties, and authorities vested in the Secretary under this Act may be retained by the Secretary for the purpose of liquidating the affairs and functions conducted under this Act.

(b) The termination of this Act shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to this Act prior to the date of such termination, or the taking of any action necessary to preserve or protect the interests of the United States in any amounts advanced or paid out in carrying on operations under this Act.

Space Age National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished news editor of the Muskegon, Mich., Chronicle. Mr. William May, has come up with a translation of the national debt which makes its enormity a bit more comprehensible—and frightening—for those who seldom find it necessary to deal or think in billions.

Bill May's description of the size of our monstrous national debt should carry some meaning and impact for today's space age generation.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial which follows is taken from the December 18, 1965, issue of the Muskegon Chronicle:

GEMINI TRIP: HOW BIG IS THE DEBT?

William A. May, the Chronicle's news editor, has tried for years to find effective ways to get people to realize the staggering size of the national debt. So have many others.

After studying the recent headlines, Mr. May came up with another comparison in the hope that public interest in Gemini 6 and Gemini 7 might be translated into still another illustration of the fact that the national debt is incomprehensively big.

Gemini 7 traveled 5,149,400 miles before its successful splash-down this morning.

This is equal roughly, to 21.6 times the distance to the moon, or nearly 11 round trips.

Currently, the national debt stands at $321,890 million.

That sum, News Editor May has calculated, doesn't mean much standing by itself. But figure it this way: If you spent the entire national debt on the number of miles traveled by Gemini 7, how much would you be spending per mile?

You'd be spending $64,000 per mile. Or, in terms of Moon travel, the present national debt would be equivalent to spending $64,000 a mile for 11 round trips to the Moon.

Does that give anybody a better picture of the extent of this country's national debt?

Formal Statement of Professors of International Law to President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, a few misguided Americans are issuing irresponsible statements condemning our Nation's military action in the defense of South Vietnam. Fortunately, these demonstrations are slacking off because the country resents them. But, this militant minority of misfits, as a group, is still grabbing a great amount of publicity and headlines—in much the same manner as the "Man Bites Dog" story.

I know that every Member of this distinguished House of Representatives is disgusted and disturbed over these headline-hunting hoodlums who brazenly burn draft cards, demonstrating contempt for the country's courageous leadership.

They have castigated our countrymen as criminal aggressors who are violating international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

But, I was exceedingly proud when a group of distinguished professors of international law from 31 universities throughout America recently sent to President Johnson a formal statement emphasizing the legality of our military assistance to the Republic of South Vietnam.

We hear very little about the fundamentals of established international law and order under which civilized nations of the world operate—compared to what we see, hear, and read from unqualified, irresponsible sources—so I proudly commend to my colleagues in the House the statement these distinguished professors of international law made through Dr. E. Ernest Goldstein, of the University of Texas School of Law, at Austin. It concerns the basic rights and responsibilities all sovereign nations have under customary international law as well as the Charter of the United Nations. The statement follows:

> As teachers of international law we wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the Government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression. We believe that the evidence indicates that the United States and South Vietnam are taking action that attacks neither the territorial integrity nor the political independence of the People's Republic of Vietnam—action that seeks only to terminate aggression originating in North Vietnam.
>
> Neill H. Alford, Jr., University of Virginia School of Law.
>
> Gordon B. Baldwin, University of Wisconsin Law School.
>
> M. Cherif Bassiouni, De Paul University College of Law.
>
> Richard R. Baxter, Harvard University Law School.
>
> William W. Bishop, Jr., University of Michigan Law School.
>
> Pasco M. Bowman II, University of Georgia School of Law.
>
> Brendan F. Brown, Loyola University School of Law, New Orleans.
>
> Austin V. Clifford, Indiana University School of Law.
>
> William T. Dean, Cornell Law School.
>
> Gray L. Dorsey, Washington University School of Law.
>
> Carl M. Franklin, University of Southern California School of Law.
>
> Richard D. Gilliam, Jr., University of Kentucky College of Law.
>
> David Ginsburg, Georgetown University Law Center.
>
> E. Ernest Goldstein, University of Texas School of Law.
>
> James F. Hogg, University of Minnesota Law School.
>
> James L. Hughes, Cumberland Law School of Howard College.
>
> Howard S. Levie, St. Louis University Law School.
>
> W. T. Mallison, Jr., George Washington University Law School.
>
> Myres S. McDougal, Yale Law School.
>
> Claude B. Mickelwait, American University, Washington College of Law.
>
> Lester B. Orfield, Indiana University School of Law.
>
> Manfred Pieck, Creighton University School of Law.
>
> John M. Raymond, University of Santa Clara School of Law.
>
> Edward D. Re, St. John's University School of Law.
>
> William H. Roberts, Catholic University of America School of Law.
>
> Louis B. Sohn, Harvard University Law School.
>
> Sherwood M. Sullivan, University of Nebraska College of Law.
>
> Howard J. Taubenfeld, Southern Methodist University School of Law.
>
> A. J. Thomas, Jr., Southern Methodist University School of Law.
>
> W. J. Wagner, Indiana University School of Law.
>
> Zigurds L. Zile, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Professor Goldstein suggested that the legal and factual propositions upon which the statement is based might be summarized as follows:

First. The Republic of South Vietnam is a recognized state.

Second. Each state has an inherent right of self defense, which may be exercised either individually or collectively, and this inherent right is recognized by the United Nations Charter for members and non-members alike.

Third. The actions of the People's Republic of North Vietnam constitute an armed attack sufficient to bring into play the inherent right of self defense.

Fourth. The Republic of South Vietnam has the right to ask for defense assistance from any state, including the United States of America, and such rendering of assistance is not aggression.

Mr. Speaker, the important thing we should remember is that South Vietnam has asked—over and over—for our help. That is why we are there. That is why we shall stay.

International Peasant Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, in the Islander of Anna Maria, Fla., an article appeared about Paul Horvat, a former Yugoslav freedom fighter and an active anti-Communist.

I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Horvat and discussing with him his idea to mobilize the peasants of the world to fight communism.

It is Mr. Horvat's personal conviction that the peasants of the world hate communism and would be an effective force in destroying that ideology.

In this critical time in our history, I believe the article from the Islander deserves to be brought to the attention of my colleagues. The news article follows:

> PAUL HORVAT, FORMER YUGOSLAV FREEDOM FIGHTER, NOW WINTER RESIDENT OF ANNA MARIA ISLAND—ACTIVE ANTI-COMMUNIST
>
> Freedom means many things to different people.
>
> To Paul Horvat, of Wilmette, Ill., and Anna Maria, it meant the end of more than a year in prison and the threat of execution for his activities as a Yugoslav freedom fighter.
>
> His fight has been waged against government misrule and foreign and Communist oppression through two world wars and the period between them. Now a softspoken, smiling suburbanite, and winter visitor to the island, he continues to work for the freedom of his countrymen and others under Communist domination through the International Peasant Movement, of which he is president ("peasant," according to the dictionary, means: "one of a chiefly European class of persons tilling the soil as small landowners or as laborers." That is the sense in which it is used here.)
>
> He writes leaflets and articles and speaks before many organizations. A New Trier Kiwanis Club member, he spoke at the club's Independence Day meeting. And during the past summer, he and representatives of 25 European and Latin American countries attended a meeting of the Peasant Movement in Munich, Germany.
>
> Paul Horvat became a freedom fighter as a boy of 18 during World War I. The son of peasants in Austro-Hungarian Slovenia, now a section of Yugoslavia, he helped to organize the Slovene Volunteers to combat misrule and foreign exploitation of his people and to try to establish Slovenia as an independent state.
>
> For this he was sentenced to die.
>
> World War I ended before he could be captured, and the state of Yugoslavia was formed. But the peasants' life did not improve. Government officials took advantage of the farmers and Communist agitators tried to exploit their plight.

"The Communists tried to gain followers by pretending to help solve our problems," Horvat explained.

He helped to organize the peasants and formed a peasant export and import association, then a farmers' savings and loan association, and later a newspaper, which he edited. He also helped to form agrarian reform, education, and youth groups as the peasants became a strong enough voting bloc to elect some of their members to the Yugoslavian legislature.

Then Nazi invaders struck.

Horvat and his wife, Mary, fled with their four children to nearby Croatia, where he began to organize persons to help refugees, political prisoners and other victims of the war. Arrested by the Gestapo, he once again was sentenced to die. He was herded with other political prisoners onto a train for Slovenia.

He found himself with 80 others in a small, dirty, unheated room. Prisoners took turns sleeping on the floor—because it was too small for all to lie down at once. Food was scarce, but interrogations long.

"Executions were held every Tuesday," Horvat recalled matter-of-factly. "I was to be shot with 150 other men and women on October 2, 1942. I hoped I would be among the first killed, so I wouldn't see the others being shot."

But only minutes before the time set for the execution, Horvat was ordered once again onto a train, headed for a prison in Croatia. As the train rolled through the town where his family had settled, it stopped. Paul Horvat jumped off and fled into the forest.

He learned later that his wife and friends had arranged his transfer, and a sympathetic railroad worker had stopped the train near the forest.

The Horvats' return to their home in Slovenia was not happy. In a few days Harvat was arrested by the Communists, who feared his popularity as a peasant leader.

He was released, but he fled when his rearrest was ordered and his land confiscated.

Police imprisoned his wife and their children to force his return, and kept Mrs. Harvat in an unheated basement without warm clothing. When she became severely ill, the family finally was released. They also fled Yugoslavia and joined Horvat in applying to enter the United States as displaced persons.

More delays again split the family as the three oldest children went to England under a work program. Mr. and Mrs. Horvat and their youngest son, Paul, waited 6 years in Austrian refugee camps.

It was during those years that Horvat organized the Congress of International Peasants Movement. In 1948, 3,500 delegates met in Austria and elected him president.

After more delays and hardships, the Horvats and their youngest son finally arrived in New York in 1952—with only $10 with which to begin a new life. A strike ended Horvat's first job, in a Gary, Ind., steel mill.

But a newspaper ad for household and garden help in Illinois opened the door to opportunity. The Horvats were hired, and within a year had saved enough money to begin their own landscaping business. And in the next few years, they saved enough money to bring their three oldest children to the United States—and to aid many other refugee families.

Horvat now operates his nursery business in Illinois with his son Branislav. The Horvats' other children also live on Chicago's North Shore.

But Horvat feels there still is much work to be done for freedom. He says, "The farmer is the key to liberating the world from communism." "The peasant is a very strong individual who, by his nature and tradition, is tied to the land. The peasant has the most vital interest in defending his land or fighting to regain it.

"Farmers also tend to be nationalistic and religious, forces which counteract communism.

"In addition, communism thrives on misery. To fight communism, we must fight misery, not wars—which kill people, rather than ideas.

"People in the free world often minimize the importance of freedom," the freedom fighter reflected, "but like sand in our hands, if we do not hold it firmly, it will slip away between our fingers."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The material in the foregoing article was taken from the Wilmette, Ill., Life.)

No Time for Haste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Review this week contains an interesting editorial which evaluates the proposal to extend the term of a Member of the House of Representatives from 2 to 4 years. The purpose of the editorial is to urge caution and most careful debate over this proposition and I believe that the reasoning which the editorial sets forth deserves review by all the Members of the House.

My own thinking has been drawn to the historical and constitutional reasoning behind the original establishment of a 2-year term. The system has worked well through most of the years of our history. At times it has resulted in some balkiness during periods when smoother transition might have been expected. On the whole, however, it has provided flexibility and established certain safeguards in maintaining a balance of Government which have worked well.

Consequently, the hesitation which I have felt about possible change without appreciable major gain has been strong. I believe that the responsible committee should look closely at all arguments relating to this constitutional change and that we in the House should debate it thoroughly in seeking the proper action. For that reason I hope that these arguments may be part of the measures we apply to the amendment when it comes before the House.

I recommend that this editorial be published in the RECORD.

NO TIME FOR HASTE

President Johnson's proposal to extend terms of Members of the House of Representatives from 2 years to 4 is understandably popular with the Congressmen themselves and, if the Gallup poll is substantially correct, with two-thirds of the electorate as well. The President, urging swift action, told Congress the other night that the present 2-year term "requires most Members of Congress to divert enormous energies to an almost constant process of campaigning—depriving this Nation of the fullest measure of their skill and their wisdom." A longer term the President argues, would attract more men of the highest quality to political life since they would have greater security and would not be forced constantly to go home and mend fences, but could concentrate their reelection activities in those years divisible by four.

But flexibility and fluidity must ever be the watchwords of government in an atomic age. Before Congress too hastily alters the intricate system of checks and balances that have worked reasonably well in the American government system, we strongly urge caution and the most careful debate rather than the "swift action" the President requests. The 2-year House term was not a quixotic, offhand notion, and to fix our legislative processes into a less subtle and more rigid form might be a disastrous mistake in the atomic age.

The Founding Fathers had sound reasons indeed for placing the House of Representatives on a biennial basis, reasons as true today as they were in 1787.

A lower House elected every 2 years more perfectly reflects the changing moods of the common people than one that stays in office for the same 4 years as the President. One does not have to go back further than 1928 to realize the sensitivity of the electorate to rapidly changing political and economic conditions, for had Herbert Hoover's majority remained intact in the House until the eve of the inauguration of Franklin Roosevelt, no one knows how near open revolution the country might have come. Similarly, the biennial election reflects much more swiftly and accurately changing population patterns. Faced with a 4-year wait until redress, many exploding urban areas might gradually be disfranchised at times when such highly metropolitan issues as civil rights, public housing, air pollution, and integrated transportation were being debated and voted on in an unrepresentative House.

Flexibility was the keynote and cornerstone of the Federal Constitution. Those wise souls who produced the incredible document sought checks and balances wherever they could find them so that no one man or branch of Government could force a foolishness permanently on the common people. Members of the House have always been elected every 2 years by popular vote, but Senators were elected by the State legislatures as recently as 1913. And the continuous overlap of the 6-year Senate term with three separate and much more sensitive Houses did not result from chance or whim but came about after great deliberation and as a careful compromise between the big States and the small.

Under the British political system, a majority in Commons can come tumbling down at any time under the stress of public dissatisfaction with an issue or trend. Popular as he was, Churchill suddenly was no longer His Majesty's First Minister when, as World War II drew to a close, the British people felt that the time was ripe for domestic reform and that Labor could accomplish it faster than Tory Churchill. This sensitivity to issues is vital to the democratic system, though it can induce bad overtones sometimes through the constant bickering of the opposition. But since the U.S. legislative system does not even have this much sensitivity to the pressures of new issues and new equations in an atomic world, any measure designed to reduce representative sensitivity by a longer House term should be debated carefully and thoughtfully and not be rammed through by voice vote without thought for the consequences to the checks and balances originally intended in the bicameral philosophy.

Bicameral legislation historically recognized the distinction between the nobility and clergy—the lords and ladies of inherited wealth and position—and the common people. The dualism now prevalent throughout the democratic world is, fundamentally, an application of the principle of checks and balances that the Jeffersons, Madisons, Franklins, and Marshalls foresaw when they wrote and interpreted the early Constitution. Not the least of the reasons behind their logic in a 2-year House term based on population and a 6-year Senate term giving equality to every State was this very check-and-balance philosophy, for which no better substitute has ever been devised. Adding to the formula, the executive branch, replaced each 4 years, and a judiciary more or less permanent and traditional, we seldom face the embarrassment of harsh and hasty legislation or, on the other hand, of a Congress totally incapable of action at a time when action is vital. With a 4-year House term this balance might be upset.

In any case, we ought to talk out thoroughly and logically any drastic change in the highly workable government equation we have built by now—R.L.T.

A Dirty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, each time human beings take up arms against each other then God must repent just a little that He created a species which has such difficulty getting along with its own kind.

Any war is terrible; but the war in Vietnam is particularly terrible.

Self-righteous, self-proclaimed, liberators of that stricken land, the Vietcong and their North Vietnamese allies, think nothing of murdering civilian populations which defy them. This includes—almost as a matter of course—women and children.

I think we will all agree with the sentiments expressed about the latest incident of this type in the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1966:

DIRTY WAR

The cruelties inflicted on the Vietnamese people by the Vietcong are so commonplace that it takes a savage incident to get the world's attention. Such an incident occurred on the eve of the recent Tet truce, in the refugee camp of Tu Hiep. Communist guerrillas stormed the unarmed camp, burned it to the ground and murdered 33 civilians. Children were cut down with submachineguns. A school built for the refugees was destroyed.

The motive for the massacre seemed to be revenge. Several of the Tu Hiep refugees had fled from a nearby village shortly after the Vietcong overran it. This apparently was insulting to the guerrillas, who constantly proclaim that they symbolize the true aspirations of the Vietnamese people. So they punished the villagers by slaughtering them. And to make sure that the world didn't misunderstand the butchery, the guerrillas scattered several leaflets among the bodies, denouncing America for its "dirty war of aggression against the people of Vietnam."

The Tu Hiep massacre rebuts the argument, popular among Vietcong apologists in this country, that the guerrillas enjoy the affection of the Vietnamese villagers. Guerrilla influence seems to extend no farther than the snout of a submachinegun. When the guns recede, the villagers flee—and the standard Vietcong reaction is more bloodshed among the innocents they claim to represent.

Letter to President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week 72 of our colleagues signed an excellent letter to the President urging him to continue efforts toward a peaceful resolution of the conflict in Vietnam. I was out of town at the time this letter was circulated or I would have been one of the original signators.

I associate myself with the views contained in that letter and so informed the President yesterday. I submit herewith the text of my letter to President Johnson.

JANUARY 26, 1966.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to associate myself with the view expressed in the letter to you of January 21, 1966, signed by some 72 of my House colleagues. Unfortunately, I was out of town when it was sent or I, too, would have been an original signer.

I heartily endorse their support for your peace initiatives combined with your determination to show Peiping and Hanoi that their policy of aggression and subversion cannot succeed.

I join in their hope that you will continue unceasingly our efforts to bring the Vietnamese conflict to the conference table. We must always keep the burden of continuation of these hostilities on the Communists. I hope you will reconsider U Thant's proposal to acknowledge a Vietcong role in negotiations and in an interim government. This seems so eminently inevitable, sensible, and important to demonstrate the sincerity of our resolve to achieve peaceful settlement. I hope you will also reconsider bringing the conflict before the United Nations.

I feel you have the confidence of the vast majority of the people of this country in your thoughtful and restrained handling of this difficult and frustrating situation.

Very sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. OTTINGER,
Member of Congress.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Hermine B. Kuhl, Three Bridges, N.J., in place of Eva Case, retired.

NEW MEXICO

Edward N. D. Fitzgerald, Jemez Springs, N. Mex., in place of B. M. Mann, retired.

NEW YORK

Roger E. Mattis, Castorland, N.Y., in place of G. K. Woods, deceased.

James H. Blaney, Franklinville, N.Y., in place of L. R. Jones, retired.

Ralph E. Christoferson, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.

Ralph G. Cascardo, Hicksville, N.Y., in place of H. C. Cotier, resigned.

James T. Duffy, Lake George, N.Y., in place of H. J. Smith, retired.

Edna C. McManus, Montrose, N.Y., in place of J. C. McManus, resigned.

Salvatore B. Aronica, North Boston, N.Y., in place of Georgia Massing, retired.

LeRoy F. Sawyer, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of M. B. Belmont, resigned.

Richard M. Duquesne, Vails Gate, N.Y., in place of J. L. Phillips, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Virginia B. Pell, Cashiers, N.C., in place of G. H. Wright, retired.

Lewis A. Thompson, Jr., Franklinton, N.C., in place of H. C. Kearney, retired.

Joseph C. Dudley, Greenville, N.C., in place of J. K. Proctor, retired.

Joseph A. Cherry, Hamilton, N.C., in place of A. R. Ewell, retired.

Walton E. Swain, Plymouth, N.C., in place of J. C. Swain, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Rex L. Powell, Columbus, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Fay, retired.

Patricia A. McGillivray, Flaxton, N. Dak., in place of E. H. Krier, retired.

John L. Wacker, Pettibone, N. Dak., in place of A. J. DeKrey, retired.

Wallace M. Holte, Stanley, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Poulsen, retired.

OHIO

Jacob Pavkov, Barberton, Ohio, in place of E. L. Davis, retired.

Louise James, Beaver, Ohio, in place of A. L. Adams, retired.

Carl C. Tschantz, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, in place of H. M. Nicol, retired.

George W. Hogg, Galena, Ohio, in place of H. L. Bricker, resigned.

John R. Adams, Germantown, Ohio, in place of C. A. Emley, retired.

Lawrence W. Haynes, Hinckley, Ohio. Office established October 10, 1959.

Merle F. Andregg, Kent, Ohio, in place of O. A. Wolcott, retired.

C. Paul Anderson, Millersburg, Ohio, in place of A. L. Fair, retired.

Floyd E. Miller, Quaker City, Ohio, in place of C. S. Hendershot, retired.

Joseph L. Dennison, Springfield, Ohio, in place of H. A. Lannert, deceased.

Joseph F. Banaski, Tiltonsville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Aiken, retired.

Gilmer T. Davis, Jr., West Richfield, Ohio, in place of C. F. Seither, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Thomas I. Mayfield, Binger, Okla., in place of J. H. Sellars, Jr., retired.

Estella George, Canadian, Okla., in place of O. W. George, deceased.

Donald R. Harrel, Leedey, Okla., in place of E. L. White, retired.

Melvin D. Skaggs, Shattuck, Okla., in place of V. A. Oates, retired.

OREGON

John H. Brader, Chemult, Oreg., in place of H. N. Brader, retired.

Esma G. Hoover, Kinzua, Oreg., in place of T. B. Hoover, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bruce L. Moore, Bear Lake, Pa., in place of E. L. Crowe, retired.

Michael Kuzman, Columbus, Pa., in place of E. H. Blanchard, retired.

Steve A. Gavorchik, Fairchance, Pa., in place of J. R. Wilson, retired.

Harry E. Roudebush, Ford Cliff, Pa., in place of R. R. Walker, retired.

Mary K. Hertzog, Lyon Station, Pa., in place of L. M. Kutz, retired.

James C. Basler, Mill Creek, Pa., in place of B. R. Faust, retired.

Herbert D. Snyder, New Bethlehem, Pa., in place of L. M. McCafferty, retired.

Joseph L. O'Connor, Phoenixville, Pa., in place of J. D. Kane, Sr., transferred.

J. Richard Hartman, Roaring Spring, Pa., in place of P. A. Martin, retired.

Georgia R. Briggs, Roulette, Pa., in place of E. R. Dexter, retired.

Louella J. Hanna, Spring Church, Pa., in place of Margaret Rosensteele, retired.

Ralph J. Brooking, Starrucca, Pa., in place of L. S. French, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Guillermo Martinez-Mateo Aibonito, P.R., in place of M. C. Abraham, retired.

Gerineldo Rivera, Cabo Rojo, P.R., in place of A. F. Irizarry, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

George J. Liegl, Burke, S. Dak., in place of C. S. Adams, retired.

Dale U. DeNure, Flandreau, S. Dak., in place of C. H. Schyan, retired.

Robert C. Uecker, Freeman, S. Dak., in place of A. A. Schmidt, retired.

Lloyd G. Haarberg, Mission Hill, S. Dak., in place of A. I. Haarberg, retired.

Henry G. Perron, Mobridge, S. Dak., in place of M. F. Broe, deceased.

Stella M. Hammill, Ree Heights, S. Dak., in place of K. H. Speirs, retired.

Lyle D. Lyons, Worthing, S. Dak., in place of E. K. Gayken, resigned.

TENNESSEE

James C. Troxler, Normandy, Tenn., in place of A. B. Wood, retired.

Vera R. Beck, Wartburg, Tenn., in place of C. F. Schubert, retired.

Mary G. England, Whites Creek, Tenn., in place of C. S. England, retired.

TEXAS

Travis W. Russell, Ackerly, Tex., in place of J. L. Rudeseal, transferred.

Charlie L. Carter, Jr., Bon Wier, Tex., in place of R. L. Hext, retired.

Calvin H. Davis, Brownfield, Tex., in place of W. C. Brown, retired.

William D. Shepherd, Channing, Tex., in place of J. E. Clanton, removed.

Norma J. Brown, Coyanosa, Tex., in place of R. E. Brown, deceased.

Douglas R. McGraw, Del Rio, Tex., in place of Raymond Ross, retired.

Jewel L. Newbrough, Hargill, Tex., in place of F. C. Newbrough, retired.

Elsie Joyce Rowe, Moscow, Tex., in place of W. C. Fancher, retired.

Delbert F. Arndt, New Ulm, Tex., in place of B. H.. Moeller, Jr., declined.

Bernie M. Smith, Pantex, Tex., in place of M. N. Lemmons, retired.

Richard T. Pawly, Pipe Creek, Tex., in place of M. M. Lewis, retired.

Irene A. Yarbrough, Princeton, Tex., in place of J. R. Gantt, retired.

Ward V. Hollingshead, San Angelo, Tex., in place of O. B. Fields, Jr., retired.

John C. Gregg, Santa Anna, Tex., in place of J. L. Strother, Jr., deceased.

Elmo J. Jacobs, Spearman, Tex., in place of D. H. Smith, resigned.

Mary K. Herring, Whitharral, Tex., in place of C. B. Kenney, retired.

Erna L. Boggus, Yancey, Tex., in place of George Heiligman, retired.

UTAH

Francis E. Haskell, Payson, Utah, in place of Vernal Twede, retired.

VIRGINIA

Marcellus G. Carpenter, Barboursville, Va., in place of B. E. Utz, retired.

Herman K. Williams, Galax, Va., in place of Fred Adams, retired.

Muriel J. Horlander, Meherrin, Va., in place of F. J. Horlander, Jr., deceased.

Clarence C. Haga, Pocahontas, Va., in place of M. R. French, retired.

James H. Hale, Richlands, Va., in place of B. P. Lambert, removed.

WASHINGTON

Carol Stipek, Bothell, Wash., in place of W. A. Penn, retired.

Horace C. Longanecker, Bridgeport, Wash., in place of Daun Ringer, retired.

LeRoy LeDuc, Granite Falls, Wash., in place of H. A. Miller, retired.

Gaynor H. Calvisky, Roslyn, Wash., in place of Thomas Woodward, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles E. Thompson, Sr., Amherstdale, W. Va., in place of Torrence Cook, deceased.

Howard A. Payne, Belington, W. Va., in place of O. O. Baughman, retired.

Henry E. Harkins, Buckhannon, W. Va., in place of C. R. Byrne, retired.

Matthew M. Kinsolving, Cedar Grove, W. Va,. in place of J. I. Knapp, retired.

Freeda F. Sherrard, Inwood, W. Va., in place of E. C. Shroades, retired.

WISCONSIN

Burton W. Sauer, Arcadia, Wis., in place of E. E. Wiffler, retired.

Duane D. Chapman, Ashippun, Wis., in place of D. E. Chapman, deceased.

James W. Stellpflug, Galesville, Wis., in place of M. H. Jacobson, resigned.

William J. Lee, Mellen, Wis., in place of H. V. Kenyon, retired.

Harris P. Johnson, Osseo, Wis., in place of R. N. Fuller, retired.

Arthur A. Pritzl, Park Falls, Wis., in place of D. F. Vicker, retired.

Mary F. Crary, Rock Springs, Wis., in place of H. A. Wiseman, deceased.

Francis J. Tachovsky, Sturgeon Bay, Wis., in place of J. C. Weitermann, retired.

Paul R. Trauba, Theresa, Wis., in place of C. H. Bodden, retired.

Appendix

Budget Becoming Political Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 10, 1966

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David Lawrence's recent column which appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Star is worthy of attention. It seems to pinpoint that in order to arrive at the rosy picture of a fiscal 1967 budget deficit of under $2 billion, the President's bookkeepers have relied upon first, Government-generated inflation; second, $5 billion in tax accelerations or reduction deferrals; third, $1½ billion in Government profit through cheapening silver coins; and, fourth, other confusing juggling of bookkeeping figures.

The above mentioned follows:

BUDGET BECOMING POLITICAL WEAPON

How many presidents of large businesses could inform their stockholders 18 months in advance of a specific date exactly how much money is going to be taken in during the interval, and how much is to be spent? Yet the President of the United States has just given the country an estimate that on June 30, 1967, receipts in the preceding 12 months will have increased by the enormous total of $11 billion over the previous year and that the budget will show a deficit of less than $2 billion.

Naturally, Johnson doesn't do all this forecasting by himself, but is dependent on a lot of financial experts. The sad truth, however, is that, no matter how conscientious they are, they cannot read the future. They cannot know what will be the ups and downs of business and how much taxes are going to be collected as a result of the business activity in the country.

During a period of 20 years—from 1947 to 1966 inclusive—budget receipts of the U.S. Treasury have been overestimated in exactly half of those years, while budget expenditures have been underestimated in 12 years.

An example of how erratic some of the estimates have been is shown by adding up the deficits and surpluses from 1955 to 1966, inclusive. For those years, the original estimates equalled an accumulated net deficit of $18.4 billion, but the actual figures finally showed a net deficit of $49.5 billion, or almost three times as much as the original estimates.

The last 2 fiscal years, 1964 and 1965, have run counter to previous experiences. Budget receipts at the end of each of the fiscal years were higher than estimated, and outlays were lower. But, despite all this, the net result was an actual combined deficit of $11.6 billion, against an estimated deficit of $16.8 billion.

It is less than 6 months now to the end of the current fiscal year on June 30, 1966, but the official estimate now by Johnson is that the deficit, which he forecast in January 1965 at $5.3 billion, is likely, 18 months later, actually to come to $6.4 billion—an underestimate of more than a billion dollars.

The January 1966 estimate for the fiscal year which ends June 30, 1967, may turn out the same way. It may reveal an overestimate of receipts and an underestimate of expenditures. There was a time when a budget document was regarded as a bookkeeping or economic tool, designed to gage the impact of Federal finances on the economy. In the past 10 years, however, this has changed drastically, and the estimates of the budget 18 months in advance have become more and more a political weapon wielded by the incumbent party.

Johnson startled many observers by his announcement that receipts are going to jump $11 billion in the next fiscal year. It is true that in war years, when huge tax increases are made, this has happened, but never in any peacetime years. Receipts have jumped considerably at different times, due to sharp increases in tax receipts or immediately after a recession. But it is surprising to find a Presidential estimate of $11 billion increase in receipts in 1 year after at least 3 years of continuing prosperity.

Some of the figures, of course, which are placed among expected receipts of the budget are not derived from taxes owed in that same year, but represent accelerated payments. Instead of letting the corporate taxpayer pay his taxes at the end of a calendar year or fiscal year, as the case may be, a business is expected to pay sums one year that normally it would not pay until the next year. In effect, the Government is borrowing from the following year's tax payments without paying interest on the advance. The object, of course, is to put corporate taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. But, once the change has been made, the ensuing years will not show any doubling up of tax payments. What is being done today might be called borrowing from Peter to pay Paul.

Likewise, when the coinage is changed and the silver is taken out of quarters and half-dollars, and the metal thus saved is regarded as a profit by the Federal Treasury, it seems strange to record this as a receipt in the same category as other annual levies, when it is a nonrecurring item. So it's hard to get any idea of whether the Federal Government is truly approaching a balanced budget or getting farther and farther away from it.

The Honorable Oren Harris

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, the Federal bench will be greatly enriched, but this House will be impoverished, when our dear friend, OREN HARRIS, leaves to take up his new duties.

I know of no man who has graced the position that OREN HARRIS has held with more dignity, more fairness, and more just plain commonsense than he has. He has fielded a great many of the tough ones in his tenure as chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he has fielded them cleanly and handled them deftly without too much fanfare and with no seeking of personal publicity. He has shown a rare ability to bring together dissidents and to bring out workable legislation.

These rare traits he takes to the Federal bench. They will stand him in good stead. The House just will not be the same with OREN HARRIS gone.

The 1964 Income of Male Cold War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 12, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include statistics provided by the Veterans' Administration on the 1964 money income of male cold war veterans:

THE 1964 MONEY INCOME OF MALE COLD WAR VETERANS (PERSONAL, FAMILY, AND UNRELATED INDIVIDUALS)

The 1964 median personal money income of the estimated 3.3 million cold war veterans (men who have served in the U.S. Armed Forces only after January 1955) was $5,100, according to a sample survey of the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States in March 1965.

About 2 out of 3 of the 3.3 million cold war veterans worked at year-round, full-time jobs in 1964, and 1 out of 3 worked part year and/or part time. Only 4 percent of the cold war veterans did not work in 1964, and included in this group are men recently separated since work experience relates only to civilian jobs.

The 2.2 million cold war veterans who worked year-round, full time had a higher median income ($6,000), as would be expected, than the 1 million part-year and/or part-time veteran workers (median—$3,100) or the 150,000 veterans who did not work (median—$1,000). As indicated earlier some of the cold war veterans were only recently separated from the Armed Forces; others were full-time students, as well as the ill and disabled and the unemployed.

Of the 3.3 million cold war veterans, 1 out of 4 (800,000) were relatives (usually the sons) of family heads, 1 out of 16 (200,000) were living alone or with a nonrelative (unrelated individuals), and 7 out of 10 or 2.3 million were heads of their own families.

The median income of the 2.3 million cold war veteran families amounted to $6,600 in 1964. Half of these families had incomes between $5,000 and $8,900. About one-fourth received less than $5,000, and of these about 25 percent had under $3,000. These relatively high incomes are in part the reflection of the general economic expansion during 1964, with increases in employment and declines in unemployment. Family income includes income of other members of the family (almost exclusively wives of cold war veterans). One out of five cold war veteran family heads was 20 to 24 years old, while almost eight out of ten were 25 to 34 years old.

Of all cold war veteran families, 99 percent were husband-wife families. These husband-wife families had the same median income in 1964 as all families—$6,600. In half of the veteran-wife families, wives contributed to the family income by working. Sixty percent of the wives of cold war veterans 20–24 years old, and 47 percent of the wives of 25–34 year-old veterans were in the labor force during all or part of 1964. Working wives increased the family income on the average by $1,000, to a median of $7,200, compared to the $6,200 median family income when wives had no earnings.

The 800,000 cold war veterans who lived with relative had a 1964 median personal income of $2,400, compared to a medain personal income of $4,600—almost twice as much—for the 200,000 veterans who have taken up independent living as unrelated individuals. Those living in a relative's family were younger—over half (55 percent) were 20–24 years old, as compared to about a third (37 percent) of the unrelated individuals in this age group. Many of these young veterans were only recently discharged from the Armed Forces—the median age at separation is 22.6 years; some were going to school; and many had not yet entered the labor force on a permanent basis.

Half of the unrelated individuals received between $3,000 and $6,700 in 1964. One-fourth received under $3,000, and 1 out of 16 had less than $1,500.

Altogether, there were about 470,000 cold war veterans who had under $2,000 income in 1964. Almost 3 out of 4 or 340,000 of these low-income veterans were living with relatives and most of them (2 out of 3 or about 230,000) were 20–24 years old. Another 1 in 7 (70,000) was a married veteran 25–34 years old.

The income distributions presented in this report and attached tables are based on approximately 1,500 sample cases of male cold war veterans. Data in the tables are presented in considerable detail for use by analysts in making various combinations of income classes. Whether the data are regrouped or not, they should be used in conjunction with the statement on "Reliability of the Estimates" and the standard error for the estimates derived from the sample survey results. The information in this note is from special tabulations of the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, made under contract for the Veterans' Administration.

SUMMARY TABLES

TABLE A.—*Money income and work experience of male cold war veterans, 1964*

Income in 1964	Work experience in 1964			
	Total	Year round, full time	Part year, part time	Did not work
Number (thousands)	3,327	2,155	1,026	146
Percent, by income	100	100	100	100
Under $1,000	7	1	15	50
$1,000 to $1,999	7	2	15	23
$2,000 to $2,999	9	4	18	12
$3,000 to $4,999	26	25	30	8
$5,000 to $6,999	28	35	15	4
$7,000 to $9,999	17	24	5	3
$10,000 and over	6	9	2	(1)
Median [2]	$5,100	$6,000	$3,100	$1,000

[1] Rounds to zero.
[2] Computed from unrounded data and rounded to the nearest hundred dollars.

TABLE B.—*Money income in 1964 of male cold war veterans, by family status*

Income in 1964	Families headed by cold war veterans				Relatives of family head [1]	Unrelated individuals
	All	Husband-wife families				
		All	Wife with earnings	Wife with no earnings		
Number (thousands)	2,279	2,252	1,115	1,137	840	208
Percent, by income	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under $1,000	1	1	(2)	2	23	4
$1,000 to $1,999	2	2	2	2	18	9
$2,000 to $2,999	4	4	3	4	17	10
$3,000 to $4,999	19	19	16	22	22	33
$5,000 to $6,999	29	29	27	31	14	22
$7,000 to $9,999	29	29	32	26	5	16
$10,000 and over	16	16	20	13	1	6
Median [3]	$6,600	$6,600	$7,200	$6,200	$2,400	$4,600

[1] Personal money income of cold war veteran; not family income.
[2] Less than 0.5 percent.
[3] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest hundred dollars.

TABLE 1.—*Money income in 1964 of male cold war veterans, by 1964 work experience and age, in the United States*

[Age in March 1965]

Income in 1964	Work experience of cold war veterans in 1964															
	Total				Year round, full time				Part year, part time				Did not work			
	All ages	20-24	25-34	35 and over	All ages	20-24	25-34	35 and over	All ages	20-24	25-34	35 and over	All ages	20-24	25-34	35 and over
Number (thousands)	[1] 3,327	977	2,256	[2] 53	[1] 2,155	394	1,712	[2] 44	[1] 1,026	501	492	[2] 8	[1] 146	[2] 82	[2] 52	[2] 1
Percent, by income	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	100.0	100.0	100.0	-------	100.0	-------	-------	-------
Under $500	4.4	8.4	2.4	-------	1.0	.7	.9	-------	6.0	7.2	4.7	-------	44.5	-------	-------	-------
$500 to $999	3.3	6.8	1.6	-------	.4	.7	.3	-------	9.2	12.0	5.6	-------	5.5	-------	-------	-------
$1,000 to $1,499	4.2	8.7	2.0	-------	.8	1.5	.7	-------	10.3	13.8	5.6	-------	10.9	-------	-------	-------
$1,500 to $1,999	2.5	3.7	1.8	-------	.8	1.5	.7	-------	4.6	4.3	4.9	-------	12.3	-------	-------	-------
$2,000 to $2,499	5.0	11.3	2.2	-------	2.3	5.5	1.5	-------	10.0	15.5	4.5	-------	8.9	-------	-------	-------
$2,500 to $2,999	4.0	7.6	2.6	-------	1.9	5.5	1.2	-------	8.3	10.0	7.1	-------	3.4	-------	-------	-------
$3,000 to $3,499	4.9	7.1	4.2	-------	4.1	9.1	3.1	-------	6.7	6.0	7.8	-------	4.8	-------	-------	-------
$3,500 to $3,999	6.4	7.3	6.2	-------	5.7	9.1	4.9	-------	8.8	7.2	11.1	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$4,000 to $4,499	7.1	9.0	6.5	-------	7.0	12.8	5.8	-------	8.1	7.4	9.2	-------	1.4	-------	-------	-------
$4,500 to $4,999	7.2	7.2	7.5	-------	8.0	10.2	7.7	-------	6.5	6.0	7.5	-------	1.4	-------	-------	-------
$5,000 to $5,499	8.5	8.2	8.7	-------	9.7	13.9	8.8	-------	6.6	5.2	8.2	-------	4.1	-------	-------	-------
$5,500 to $5,999	6.8	4.5	7.8	-------	9.2	9.1	9.3	-------	2.8	1.7	3.3	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$6,000 to $6,999	12.1	5.6	15.1	-------	16.0	10.6	17.3	-------	5.7	2.6	8.9	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$7,000 to $7,999	8.9	3.7	11.3	-------	12.7	7.7	13.9	-------	2.2	1.1	3.5	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$8,000 to $8,999	5.4	.3	7.5	-------	7.5	.7	8.9	-------	1.6	(3)	3.1	-------	1.4	-------	-------	-------
$9,000 to $9,999	3.1	.3	4.4	-------	4.3	.7	5.2	-------	.8	(3)	1.7	-------	1.4	-------	-------	-------
$10,000 to $14,999	4.9	.3	6.7	-------	7.0	.7	8.1	-------	1.2	(3)	2.4	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$15,000 to $24,999	1.1	(3)	1.4	-------	1.4	(3)	1.6	-------	.5	(3)	.9	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
$25,000 and over	.1	(3)	.1	-------	.2	(3)	.1	-------	.1	(3)	-------	-------	(3)	-------	-------	-------
Median (dollars) [4]	5,060	3,240	5,780	-------	5,950	4,670	6,300	-------	3,120	2,410	3,940	-------	1,000	-------	-------	-------

[1] Includes cold war veterans under 20 years of age.
[2] Distribution and median not shown when base is less than 100,000.
[3] Rounds to zero.
[4] Computed from unrounded data, and rounded to the nearest $10.

NOTE.—Percents shown to nearest 10th for combining income classes in analyses of data, and not to indicate this degree of accuracy. In developing estimates, particularly for smaller population bases, percents should be rounded to nearest whole percent. For sampling variability see statement on "Reliability."

Friday, January 28, 1966

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate continued to debate motion to take up right-to-work repeal.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 1329–1360

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2844–2852; S.J. Res. 131; and S. Con. Res. 73. **Pages 1329–1330**

Right To Work: Senate continued to debate Mansfield motion to take up H.R. 77, repealing the right-to-work provisions (sec. 14(b)) of the National Labor Relations Act, and proposed amendments thereto. **Pages 1360–1371, 1377–1393**

Nominations: Senate received the following nominations: Henry Allen Moe, of New York, to be Chairman of the International Endowment for the Humanities; and numerous postmasters. **Pages 1393–1395**

Quorum Calls: Two quorum calls were taken today. **Pages 1335, 1377**

Program for Saturday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 5:10 p.m. until 10 a.m. Saturday, January 29, when it will continue consideration of motion to take up H.R. 77, right-to-work repeal. **Page 1393**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

NOMINATION

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences: Committee ordered favorably reported the nomination of Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Prior to this action, committee held hearings on this nomination where favoring testimony was received from Senators Kennedy of Massachusetts and Saltonstall. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

FOREIGN AID

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee held hearings on S. 2793, authorizing an additional $415 million for the foreign aid program, receiving testimony from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Administrator of the Agency for International Development David E. Bell.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Committee approved for reporting the following four nominations: Harold Howe II, of North Carolina, to be Commissioner of Education, HEW; Franklyn A. Johnson, of California, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity; Dr. Stewart G. Wolf, Jr., of Oklahoma, and Dr. William B. Bean, of Iowa, both to be members of the Board of Regents, National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, January 31, 1966, at 12 o'clock noon. For program see Congressional Program Ahead in this Digest.

Committee Meetings

AIRCRAFT PHASEOUT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee No. 2 met in executive session and continued hearings on

Appendix

The Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial which appeared in the Longview Daily News, January 26, 1966.

We all are proud of the great progress which has characterized our area.

No one man has exerted more successful efforts to bring about this progress than Publisher Carl Estes, of the Longview Daily News-Journal:

THE PRODUCERS

Constructive history is a moving chronicle of the producers. It wastes little time on the foibles of men, even less on their failures. Its emphasis, for the guidance and inspiration of new generations, is upon ideas and their originators, plans and their improvisers, results and the men who produce them.

Thirty-five years is a brief span of time, as history is measured. Into the short period since the Lathrop discovery well put Longview and Gregg County in the national spotlight as the greatest oil producing area in America has been compressed the record of a speed and variety of progress seldom if ever recorded in history.

If our hundreds of guests for this 35th anniversary celebration—headed by our distinguished Gov. John B. Connally and other high State officials—could look into the record of Longview's growth, they would find these marks of progress, comparing 1930 figures with 1965: population 5,026, up about 10-fold to nearly 50,000; bank deposits $1,464,000, now $76,117,992; water customers 958, now 14,905; electric customers 1,302, now 16,150.

Longview today has some 130 industrial plants, and 5 planned industrial districts offer new industry every desired facility. The Longview-Gregg County labor market affords 33,430 jobs, a record high. From our diversified economic base flowed estimated individual income of $188,489,000 in 1965, resulting in estimated sales of $140,800,000.

Industrial and commercial growth in Longview in 1965—including new plants, business and public buildings, residences, schools, and churches—totaled some $55 million. Another $12 million of highway improvements were under way. The Gregg County Airport, expanding and adding new facilities, by latest report was No. 1 in East Texas in passenger boardings, with large gains recorded in air express, airfreight, and airmail tonnage.

The famed Lathrop and two other discovery wells alerted the petroleum industry to the existence of a giant oil reservoir and the east Texas field developed into a $15 billion bonanza with more than 25,000 producing wells. It has produced 3.7 billion barrels of oil and has another 1.7 billion barrels of recoverable reserves—thanks to the early vision and hard work of a few pioneers in conservation who helped bring order out of early chaos.

Preserving reservoir pressure through hard-won conservation measures and a major secondary recovery program has assured the field another 40 years of production at near current rates, and many wells are expected to be producing oil 100 years from now. The oil industry payroll in Gregg County last year exceeded $13 million, and added productive life of the field will long continue to bring major benefits to producers, royalty owners, service and supply firms, industry officials and workers, and to wholesale and retail business in this area.

Spotlighted in the perspective of a 35-year time span, credit for the discovery and development of the great east Texas field, for its preservation through orderly production and conservation, for the diversified industrial progress that has come in more recent years, and for the commercial, educational, and cultural prosperity that has followed, must go to a group of leaders whom we shall call "the producers." These have been the men with vision, ideas, and plans, and the courage and energy to produce results.

As we welcome our guests today, we salute the pioneers of oil, the prime movers of industrial development, and the producers of civic and educational and governmental progress.

Because of the pioneering vision and spirited leadership of one particular man who has given unreservedly of his physical strength and means to so many of the phases of progress, we who have worked closest with him across the years believe we bespeak the feelings of the people as we dedicate this 35th oil anniversary issue to our publisher and the friend of Longview and east Texas, Carl L. Estes.

THE STAFF OF THE NEWS AND JOURNAL

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Birthday Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 84th birthday anniversary of the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt—one of the greatest Presidents of all time. I ask my colleagues to join with me in paying special tribute to this truly outstanding humanitarian and distinguished world leader.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call to your attention a portion of page 809 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 30, 1948. The letter published therein and reproduced below was written by the late Fleetwood Richards, Sr., of Lockhart, Tex., whose son, Fleetwood Richards, Jr., now serves as my administrative assistant in Austin. Senator Richards was one of the greatest honest-to-goodness humanitarian leaders who ever lived. He knew human nature better than any man I have known.

Few men have been more loyal to the ideals of a President than Mr. Richards, Sr., was to President Roosevelt. His letter to his lovely wife is a warm and touching reflection of the love our country held for President Roosevelt. Similarly, the letter written to the then Congressman Lyndon B. Johnson was a tribute to the love and affection he held for Mr. Johnson whose cause he supported from the first day. He recognized then, as we all do now, that Mr. Johnson, a close friend and supporter of President Roosevelt, was an unusual leader—a warmhearted man whose star was ascending and who possessed qualities similar to those of President Roosevelt.

The letter was placed in the RECORD 18 years ago yesterday by the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, my predecessor, who now serves as our great President.

Both the letter and Mr. Johnson's remarks, then as now, are fitting memorials to the late F.D.R. They are as follows:

THE LATE FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on this day in 1882 was born a man destined to guide his country through its greatest perils. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt loved his countrymen, so they loved him. That affection of one man for the many—and of the many for one man—bound our Nation together in a unity we have missed since he left us.

The altogether personal affection so many millions of us felt for Mr. Roosevelt was brought into poignant focus when he died. In our teeming cities, in small towns, at crossroad stores, and along lonely country trails, almost unbearable grief came to the people of America.

To those shocking words, "Roosevelt is dead," men, women, and children reacted as though the news concerned one near and dear to them. Some wept. Some were swept by black despair. Some were appalled at the unfillable gap left in the world's leadership.

In the small town of Lockhart, Tex., in my congressional district, one who loved Roosevelt found some comfort in the way so many of us find it: He told his wife what was in his heart. She was away from home, and he wrote her. I lately obtained a copy of that letter, written by Fleetwood Richards, of Lockhart.

Mr. Richards has a distinguished record of public service in our Texas Legislature. Because his letter so beautifully expressed the sorrow so many of us felt on that fateful day in 1945, and expressed it in language beyond our capacity, I have presumed upon my friendship with Mr. Richards to offer the letter today as a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

LOCKHART, TEX.,
April 13, 1945.

MY DEAREST GUSSIE: Roosevelt is dead. Sorrow and gloom shrouds the town of Lockhart and its people. Business and people are almost at a standstill. Golf has not been mentioned in almost a full day. The report of his death reached me in the Domino Hall. That is where Americanism lingers in the rough. There is where it is most typical. There is where Roosevelt is most loved and appreciated. There is where labor relaxes and recreates. The news stopped every game. No sounds were audible, except sighs. The leader of their hopes, the prince of their cause, their refuge, had gone. Silently, they went away. They walked slower, they talked less, and they thought more. It was the saddest moment in all American life. Their ship was without a rudder.

In his going, anxiety reached its greatest peak. Determination did not seem to falter or hesitate. It seemed to absorb vengeance. Hope was uncertain. It must wait. The future must build and sustain it. World peace took a body blow. It did not fall. It did not take the count. It is disappointed, and that disappointment should be, and must be, its inspiration and determination to work, to sacrifice, and to succeed. It is hunmanity's only hope.

In a weak and humble way, on every occasion, and at every call, I have tried to shoulder my responsibility to him and the cause that he represents. Maybe I have been a small part of a great undertaking. I feel so. I served him and his cause, and the people's cause, as I see it, with an apostle's devotion free of selfish motive.

I say, and maybe I never could have said it before, a man is dead that I never doubted or questioned. Somehow, I followed him and his leadership with a faith and confidence, free of every doubt. He gave a part of his life's span to the cause of humanity and liberty. In it all, I think that he was conscientious. To the downtrodden, he was as faithful as Paul was to Christ. He served and saved others. "Himself he could not save."

I never committed an act or spoke a word that made his road longer or its burden heavier. I never added weight to his weakened body or his troubled mind. I tried to give him strengh. I might have been, and I think that I was, a little more diligent and devoted to him, and the purposes and ideals that he championed, than I have been to myself and my own soul. In it all, I am satisfied.

Love,

FLEETWOOD.

Aerospace Technology Help for Tomorrow's Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, monumental problems of residential and commercial blight, air and water pollution, traffic congestion, street crime and delinquency, and others await solution. In the 1965 fourth quarter edition of Sperryscope, a publication of the Sperry Rand Corp., Karl G. Harr, Jr., authored an article on the application of aerospace technology and systems analysis techniques to the burgeoning problems of our major population centers. Mr. Harr, president of Aerospace Industries Association, has a distinguished record of Government service.

The article follows:

AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY HELP FOR TOMORROW'S CITIES

(By Karl G. Harr, Jr.)

I do not make any claim to knowledge about urban problems in general. My credentials are limited to matters of concern for that unique industry called aerospace—the large but rather rarefied industry which is primarily engaged in producing the Nation's complex equipment for defense and space exploration. The times have made the aerospace industry a fascinating business, a glamorous one, and one intimately involved in the Nation's security and well-being.

There is much more to be learned from the aerospace industry's experience over the past decade or so than the straightforward stories of how it became what it is today and what its problems are for the future. Because of the pressure under which it has operated it has, in turn, forged some rather uncommon industrial capabilities, and because of the unique relationship which it has both suffered and enjoyed with its principal customer, the Government of the United States, this experience has potential application to the problems of our cities.

Tangible and intangible manifestations of the space age—or more properly, perhaps, the areospace age—are all around us. They even pervade our advertising commercials and public relations programs. "Space age circultry" is advanced as the key to superior TV sets; "jet," whether it be jet age fashions or the New York Jets, has become a common term to describe that which is favorably modern. Our children's interest and our own attention as TV viewers and newspaper readers is heavily engaged by aerospace matters. In short, the speed and scope of the accelerating technology of our times and its impact on our lives have been largely accepted psychologicaly by the public. In the most superficial sense, the implications of the aerospace age have been accepted as something positive.

At the other end of the spectrum, in the pursuit of genuine aerospace activities, the aerospace age is fully upon us. Government and private customers and their industrial suppliers of aerospace equipment have had to come face to face with the realities of moving at full speed into this complex new dimension. What is still sometimes lacking is an appreciation of the implications of this age in the approach to our hard present and future problems of a nonaerospace nature. In short, whereas space-age thinking is prevalent at the most superficial public level and within the actual aerospace itself, it often is totally lacking in between.

SOME KEY ELEMENTS

Aerospace has become a very large industry, which today stands as the Nation's largest manufacturing employer, employing well over a million people. It is the Nation's second largest manufacturing industry in terms of sales. Its products and services are highly technical and it is, therefore, a technically oriented industry. More than one-fifth of the Nation's scientists and engineers are employed in the aerospace industry. While it produces all of the Nation's commercial and private aircraft and helicopters, each year about 85 percent of its product is sold to the Federal Government. It is highly competitive for this government business, and the principal commodity with which it competes is its rarefied engineering skill and capacity to manage the research, development, and production of highly complex systems.

Advancing technological knowledge has rendered the task of meeting the Nation's defense needs unbelievably sophisticated. And, of course, the simple physical absolutes of exploring space in and of themselves produce this same challenge. Thus, for an industry to be in this game, as contrasted with any normal commercial enterprise, has involved entering a whole new era and a whole new dimension of industrial considerations.

Some of these considerations have to do with devising radically new industrial techniques, manufacturing processes, reliability and quality assurance safeguards, uses of materials, and even the materials themselves. Some have to do with learning to live with a single and peculiar customer such as the Government. Some have to do with setting standards and living with tolerances such as industry has never faced before. Some have to do with systems, management challenges of a complexity not provided on our industrial scene except by defense and space requirements.

The capability essential to defense and space efforts is that one required when making complex systems analyses. It is this capability that must be called upon when the objective is a fixed, but nearly impossible one, such as the need to analyze 10 years in advance what will be required on each of a thousand interrelated fronts in order to get man safely to the moon and back. In one form or another, the problems our cities are faced with offer challenges in systems analysis of a comparable order.

President Johnson, on signing the bill creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development, declared: "We are going out to meet tomorrow and master its opportunities before its obstacles master us. * * * Unless we seize the opportunities available now, the fears some have of a nightmare society could materialize. * * * In the next 35 years we must literally build a second America."

CHALLENGE OF THE MEGALOPOLIS

On the east coast, there is a sprawling conglomeration of cities and towns that stretches all the way from Back Bay Boston to the Chesapeake Bay. Thirty-seven million people, or almost one-fifth of our national population, are jammed into this area, which comprises less than 2 percent of the land area of the United States. By the year 2000, or just 35 years from now, there will be 64 million people in this northeast corridor.

Similar concentrations of population, with all their attendant problems, are forming in the great central valley of the United States, along the west coast, and across the gulf coast Our present population of 200 million is expected to double by the year 2000, and the overwhelming majority of these people will be city dwellers. In other words, we will have a population about equal to that of present-day India. Those who would spread alarm at this fact suggest that on New Year's Eve, in the year 1999, standard celebration equipment should be a padlocked personal water bottle and an oxygen mask.

The rapidly increasing population and the even more rapidly accelerating trend toward urbanization have disrupted patterns of housing, schools, transportation, and all the thousands of services that a modern urban center demands. Monumental problems of residential and commercial blight, air and water pollution, traffic congrestion, street crime and delinquency on a scale never before experienced are either here or just around the corner as the pressures increase.

No private individual, no company, no citizens' group, or municipal agency alone can grasp these problems in their entirety. They are so interrelated that to try to solve any one of them in isolation from the others is often to create more new ones than are cleared up by the effort. This dilemma so far has frustrated most attempts to come to grips with these problems.

This condition of paralysis need not obtain. None of the aforesaid challenges lies beyond our already existing capacity to cope with them. The tools are already at hand. Included among those tools not only are the technological capabilities but also the experience in systems management and systems analysis as well as proved patterns of joint public and private effort.

THE EXPERIENCE OF AEROSPACE

The two decades of intense experience of what is today's aerospace industry have an important message. What have been the principal elements of this industry's experience during that period?

First, it has had to design and produce at the very threshold of our technology; additionally, it has had to foster research that would constantly advance that threshold. The technological challenges presented by the worst of any big city's problems cannot compare in complexity with some of those presented by our national defense and space efforts.

Second, aerospace industry has had to adopt and adapt every aspect of industrial performance to these stringent requirements. Where personnel had to be motivated to absolute standards of performance—zero defects as one company calls it—devices for such motivation have been created. Where standards of reliability require environmental conditions of suprasurgical cleanliness, in which temperature changes and even human perspiration could not be allowed, such environmental conditions also were created. Where adequate metals or other materials were not available, they had to be invented; and for virtually all standard materials, new means of working and using them had to be devised. Production managers had to learn to live with requirements that called for machining tolerances down to millionths of an inch. For an idea as to the size of a millionth of an inch, try to visualize a pile of quarters three times as high as the Empire State Building in New York City. A millionth of an inch would be represented by just one quarter. "Man-rating" the most complex equipment American industry has ever been called upon to produce had its impact on every aspect of manufacturing.

Third, it was necessary to evolve a whole new philosophy and modus operandi for the Government-industry partnership in the pursuit of its mammoth tasks. Never before had so large a segment of private industry worked for so long in such close proximity with the Government. No one on either side had a manual describing how much Government control was necessary to protect the public interest and how much freedom of action must be retained by the contractor in order to preserve the vital aspects of free enterprise. Even today, no one can say with any exactitude just where the lines should be drawn in every case. But it has been established through experience and with growing recognition of the true values that a workable and efficient and productive system can be evolved that will get these jobs done, fully preserve the public interest, and yet promote the continued viability of free enterprise.

Finally, and perhaps most important, just by having to look these staggering challenges in the face and find a way to cope with them efficiently, a whole new approach—perhaps a whole new profession—has evolved. It is generally called systems analysis.

SYSTEMS ANALYSIS

Systems analysis is not a new term. Many members of other industries will ask, "What do they think we've been doing in our industry?" Quite right. Many of today's industrial challenges require a high degree—compared to earlier times—of what may fairly be described as systems analysis.

But no industry geared to the commercial marketplace has had to face challenges of a technological complexity or size even approaching those which have become the steady diet of the aerospace industry. For that industry has had to move as far and as fast as science and technology would permit, given the pressures of national defense and space requirements. Moreover, the accelerating rate of scientific and technological advance has permitted the levying of national requirements of fantastic complexity. Lunar exploration, though perhaps the most dramatic of these, is but one such complex system.

What has all of this to do with the future of our great cities? What has it to do with the role a civic-minded man who is a lawyer, a banker, a teacher, or a businessman, can play in his community's future? Simply this. Much of what lies ahead is no mystery. We know much of what the future will bring in terms of problems. We know they will be big, complex, and serious. And we know what many of them are. These problems represent the "givens." We know they will be there—and we know they will overwhelm us if we do not find the means to cope with them. What we lack, thus far, is conviction that there is a means of getting hold of them. They seem so staggering in their size and complexity, so far beyond the capability of any single institutional segment of the community, public or private.

They are not. The State of California has called on the talents of the aerospace industry to take the first step toward measuring these problems and analyzing them. Research contracts were let to that industry to study four key areas: transportation, pollution, information collection, and crime control. Governor Brown made these comments about the first of these contracts to be completed, the one on crime:

"The systems engineers put California in a laboratory, so to speak, and in just 6 months, they have documented many methods of dealing with crime they think could be improved. They believe that in 5 years we could rearrange our court procedures, improve our methods of predicting outbreaks of crime, change our approach to parole, and produce a more efficient system for dealing with crime at a lower cost." Governor Brown went on to say, "We intend to call this report to the attention of officials in Washington, to point out its national applications, and to ask for financial help in pushing through the followup work that must be done to put this new systems approach into operation."

I do not mean to state or imply that only the aerospace industry can solve urban problems. The aerospace industry does not have a monopoly on modern problem solving or systems analysis techniques. However, the approach, the attitudes, the acceptance of the realities of today and the future as they are—not as we might wish they were—which have been brought about by the aerospace age are essential to cope with the future.

Despite all the gloom and doom about what faces us in the urban areas, the space age is going to be our greatest era here in the United States in all respects. The challenge of space has both emancipated our thinking and better equipped us to cope with problems of a new and greater dimension. This is the true fallout of the space age, not the new metals, the new techniques, the new processes that will make better automobiles and TV circuits. It is the confidence and determination to tackle the problems of the future positively, whether their size, complexity, or nature. Given the problems that face us, such emancipation, stimulus, and determination could not have come at a better time.

Budget's Brinkmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, January 25, Mr. Richard F. Janssen had an article entitled "Budget's Brinkmanship," in which he gives a very good analysis of the recent budget submitted by the President as to its inflationary prospects. His article follows:

BUDGET'S BRINKMANSHIP—IT STEERS ALONG A NARROW ROAD BETWEEN ECONOMIC STIMULUS, INFLATIONARY DESPAIR

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—The Federal budget that went to Congress at noon yesterday, quite unlike all the others in the Kennedy-Johnson era, isn't intended to boldly spur the economy into ever-speedier expansion. It features tax increases instead of tax cuts, blocks Federal spending from carving out a bigger share of the whole economy, and boasts the skimpiest deficit in 7 years.

Yet, this budget is the one that surely will send the economy galloping closer to the brink of inflation than any of its five Democratic predecessors.

What makes the crucial difference is that, thanks at least in large measure to the tax cuts and spending increases of the last few years, the administration has just about succeeded in closing the once-wide gulf between what the economy is actually producing and the potential that its manpower and machinery provide.

Once the economy comes in sight of this Camelot of full employment, it's treading into long-unvisited territory that holds not only the promise of unparallel abundance but the peril of manpower-barrel scraping, factory bottlenecks, and, consequently, ballooning prices and wages.

POISED TO PULL BACK

The peril appears sufficiently real, in fact, that authorities are already watching for roadsigns that will tell them if they must yank back on the fiscal reins. Should spending head up only a billion or two from what's now budgeted, probably nothing new would happen. "But if it's up by 3 or 3½ billion we'd have a real hard choice," one official frets. And a rise of $5 billion would surely mean a rise in taxes.

If the administration weren't worried about the risks of plunging too rapidly into this long-sought realm, of course, it wouldn't be taking such considerable pains to avoid arriving with a final dramatic burst of speed. "The most present danger before us," Treasury Secretary Fowler said last week, "is the danger of economic excess, not economic deficiency." In his budget message, President Johnson found himself constrained to tell would-be bigger spenders that "even a prosperous nation cannot meet all its goals at once," and to assert that "inflation need not be the price of social progress; nor should it be the cost of defending freedom."

Thus, the administration is willing to attempt a hasty about-face on auto and telephone excise taxes, to ask Congress to make corporations pay up their income taxes more promptly, and to pull personal income taxes in more rapidly by scaling up withholding rates for middle and upper income groups. It's willing to stir grumping among air travelers by seeking a ticket tax increase, and to risk the political crossfire that's apt to pepper its budget bid for savings on such sacrosanct items as milk for schoolchildren.

But despite the revenueraising, the cost cutting and the unaccustomed words of restraint, the fact of the projected $1.8 billion deficit shows that revenues aren't expected to quite match the growing outlays for the Great Society and the increasingly great war in Vietnam. A deficit there is still to be, when considering that the figure is preshrunk by the planned selloff of billions of dollars worth of stockpiled mortgages and metals. The Government still plans to spend $6.4 billion more in the fiscal year starting July 1 than it's spending in this one, bringing the administrative budget total to a record $112.8 billion. An obscure account back on page 394 of the budget document, moreover, shows that the new year's gross spending and lending by the Government (without the usual offsets of loan repayments and the like) will mount by $12 billion from this fiscal year and by a much steeper $30 billion from the last one, to a mammoth $175 billion.

A LEGITIMATE QUESTION

There's always some question, of course, whether any budget that calls for more spending than taxing is one of restraint, and it's a question that officials recognize as legitimate. In his weekend budget press conference, Mr. Fowler was careful to say only that the budget is "moving in the direction" of exercising restraint on the economy.

Perhaps the best way to appraise administration intent on this score is to say that, instead of either positive stimulus or outright drag, it's aiming for fiscal neutrality. This shows up more clearly in the two alternative budget measures which economists generally consider a better guide to economic impact than the headline-getting administrative budget. The cash budget, which includes the big social security and other trust funds, actually projects a $500 million surplus, and the national income accounts (which show corporate income taxes as they accrue rather than as they're paid) projects an equally modest $500 million deficit.

But even this greatly watered-down injection of red ink, considering everything else going on in the economy, could conceivably prove too rich a mixture. Indeed, the budget itself cautions candidly that with the "proposed substantial increase in Federal spending added to the expected further strong rises in private investment and consumption," the 7-percent advance estimated for the whole economy in calendar year 1966 will bring it "sufficiently close to full employment of its resources to raise the threat of price instability."

And lately, both Federal spending and the whole economy have a way of surpassing the Government's forecasts. A year ago, the Budget Bureau was projecting $99.7 billion of Federal spending for this fiscal year, a sum that's now seen as $106.4 billion. Also a year ago, the Council of Economic Advisers was forecasting that gross national product in 1965 would grow by 6 percent; as things turned out, GNP spurted 7.5 percent. Mr. Fowler's forecast that overall prices this year will rise about 1.9 percent, or slightly less than the 2 percent of 1965, is already viewed as perhaps too comfortable an assumption.

TAX INCREASES CONSIDERED

The prospect of bursting the inflationary bounds seems real enough that officials are already talking privately about the stern actions they might have to take. Even greatly favored civilian spending programs in the Great Society realm of health and welfare would suddenly become much more vulnerable, and rate increases in individual or corporate income taxes, or both, would come under very serious consideration. There's still a margin for budget bulges left in the economy, planners say, but it's much thinner than in other recent years.

Even without the need for any such fiscal actions being established, administration officials are starting to talk a harder-than-ever line to businesses about holding back on price increases. Significantly, it was Commerce Secretary Connor, openly unenthusiastic about "guideposts" when he moved in from the drug business last year, who told the Economic Club of Detroit yesterday that "the only reasonable course of action" is "not less cooperation, but more cooperation and understanding between business and Government" at a time when the President sees that "prices and wages threaten to escalate to inflationary levels."

Mr. Connor denounced as "out of the question" the thought of falling back on laissez-faire economic theory and accepting "the inevitable inflation" that would follow a collision between an expanding economy and growing military requirements. The other option, "some form of legislative controls over wages and prices," is one that nobody wants, he said. He didn't denounce it as "out of the question," though. Perhaps he couldn't, when the administration is committed to a budget that's designed to keep the economy galloping happily along the brink of inflationary despair.

What's a Billion Dollars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I think very few really understand the immensity of the $112.8 billion budget of the Federal Government.

As was observed by Mr. David Lawrence in his nationally syndicated column of January 25, 1966, the Federal budget was well below $1 billion in 1910. And the dollar at that time was worth four times what it is today.

The great depression of the 1930's apparently set the deficit multiplication program in high gear. We have been in that gear ever since.

In the interest of a better understanding of the meaning of the Federal budget, I commend Mr. Lawrence's column:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Jan. 25, 1966]

WHAT'S A BILLION DOLLARS?

(By David Lawrence)

What's a billion dollars? How many people, when they read about President Johnson's proposed budget for next year, can readily imagine what an expenditure of $112.8 billion really means?

How many people are aware also that the United States not many years ago got along on less than one-hundredth of the sum that is going to be spent next year by the U.S. Government?

When this correspondent came to Washington in 1910 to write about governmental affairs, the Federal budget was well below $1 billion. Thus, for the fiscal year 1911, expenditures amounted to only $691 million and there was a surplus of $11 million. The public debt itself, covering all the years since the start of the Republic, amounted to less than $1.2 billion.

But the dollar had a big purchasing power in those days. In fact, expressed in terms of 1965 dollars, it was nearly four times as large as it is today.

Yet, $691 million paid in 1911 for all the expenses of the Government of the United States—all pensions, all costs for the Army and the Navy, and all expenses in foreign lands, as well as the cost of operating the legislative, executive, and judicial branches.

The Federal budget, moreover, stayed well below $1 billion until the United States entered World War I in 1917. While the annual expenditures rose to $18.4 billion in 1919, the Federal budget steadily declined afterward so that in the fiscal year 1927, when Calvin Coolidge was President, the budget expenditures were only $2.8 billion, and there was a surplus of over a billion dollars. the public debt, which had reached $25.4 billion in 1919, was gradually diminished in the 11 years thereafter until by 1930 it reached a low point of approximately $16.2 billion.

The depression of the 1930's again raised the public debt as the deficits multiplied. Then came the big expenditures for World War II, which left the United States with a debt of approximately $259 billion in 1945.

The public debt since World War II has risen to $320 billion. This has been due not to any major war—though the Korean war temporarily increased the debt—but to rising expenditures for armament and a series of unbalanced budgets.

Today, the defense budget alone as proposed for next year is to be $58.3 billion. While $10 to $12 billion of this sum will be used for added costs of the Vietnam war, most of the money is appropriated to maintain large armaments in preparation for any third world war that may come.

Federal expenditures today, however, are large in nonmilitary categories. The Federal Government has undertaken to supplement the appropriations of the States and cities in many fields of human affairs. As population has grown, the Federal Government's intervention in the economic and sociological life of the country has increased.

But the basic factor—how to maintain stability in the purchasing power of the dollar—has been a dilemma faced not just in war years but in many of the peacetime years that have preceded or followed major wars. The purchasing power of the dollar has steadily gone down. Even in the last 10 years, the public debt has gone up from $272 billion to $320 billion, and the accumulated deficits of the last 10 years have been approximately $47 billion.

Interest on the public debt alone now amounts to $12.8 billion a year, which is more than 18 times what it cost to run the whole Government when this correspondent was first covering the White House.

So when there is talk of nearly $113 billion for next year's budget, it is pertinent to observe that the dollar doesn't buy as much as it did 10, 20, or 40 years ago, and that the big figures in the annual expenditures nowadays reflect, to a large extent, the steady decline in the purchasing power of the dollar and an indifference to balanced budgets.

New Cold War GI Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my distinguished chairman and able colleague, OLIN TEAGUE, in introducing a new cold war GI bill of rights.

My recent visit to South Vietnam reemphasized to me the urgent need for this legislation. Servicemen in all branches of the service from private to General Westmoreland said this bill would boost the morale of our fighting men and is just and fair.

Mr. Speaker, the new features of this bill include a clarification of veterans preference rights, extension of wartime presumptions to chronic and tropical diseases, extension of medical care to non-service-connected veterans, and payment of education and training fees for servicemen, who, after 2 years' service are still in uniform.

While visiting hospitals in Vietnam, I learned that over half the casualties suffered by our servicemen are a result of hepatitis, malaria, and countless jungle diseases.

This new bill would retain the educational, vocational training, and on-farm training, job counseling and placement, and loan features of the bill which I introduced earlier this year.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this new bill will have a better chance of final passage because it will have more widespread support in the Congress and among veterans' organizations.

Use of Nuclear Weapons in Vietnam War Is Inadvisable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of its Nuclear Affairs Committee, I have issued to the House GOP conference the following communication which may be of interest to others also:

INADVISABILITY OF USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AGAINST NORTH VIETNAM

Frequently Members of Congress receive letters recommending that atomic weapons be used against North Vietnam "to win the war." As chairman of your Nuclear Affairs Committee I have made an analysis of this proposition which concludes that this type of weapon is unsuitable for use under present circumstances.

The President and other administration officials have directly or indirectly indicated these reasons for not using such weapons in Vietnam: (a) Fear that this degree of escalation would cause North Vietman's Communist nuclear allies, the U.S.S.R. and Red China, to come into the war with their nuclears and a general escalation into nuclear world war III, could ensue; (b) reluctance to even talk much about atomic weapons use because it might impede the administration's drive for a nonproliferation treaty.

Reason (a) is an application of the "no threshold theory" which assumes that any nuclear weapons use, no matter how limited and discrete, will grow into a general holocaust. The theory is far from universally accepted. Reason (b) is an arguable assumption—the effect might be just the opposite.

Sounder reasons for rejecting use of atomic weapons at this stage of the war include—

1. Tropical forest areas are not particularly suitable ones for effective use of nuclear explosives.

2. Urban areas of North Vietnam, even including Hanoi and Haiphong, are of insufficient size to indicate any advantage of nuclear over conventional explosives.

3. Radioactive aftereffects of nuclear explosives are a nuisance which is unnecessary to create in order to accomplish desired military objectives.

4. Psychological attitudes—justified or unjustified—relating to nuclear weapons would provide opportunities for worldwide anti-American propaganda of greater detriment to our cause than benefits calculable from using them.

5. Even the use of conventional explosives against a backward, underdeveloped country like Vietnam has proved only marginally productive. Employment of a "bigger bang" cannot be expected to remedy this difficulty.

Of course, should Red China enter the war openly with large military forces, all bets would be off and the use of both strategic and tactical nuclear weapons most proabably would be indicated.

In order to make this study on nuclear weapons vis-a-vis the Vietnam war it has been necessary to make a careful analysis of the nature of the war itself, both in the north and in the south. This study reveals several major miscalculations by President Johnson and Secretary McNamara which appear to support charges that the U.S. effort is being seriously and tragically mismanaged at the very top by these civilian chiefs of our Military Establishment. This topic will be discussed in subsequent communications.

Community College System Can Be a Model for Nation, Conferees Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the University of Kentucky under Dr. John Oswald is making great strides in bringing higher education to added thousands of young Kentuckians. The following story from the Louisville Times illustrates what scholars from the State of Florida think about our great community college system. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Times, Jan. 6, 1966]

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM CAN BE A MODEL FOR NATION, CONFEREES TOLD

LEXINGTON.—A Florida college administrator says the Kentucky system of community colleges is on its way to becoming one of the best in the Nation and a model for other States.

Dr. Robert Wiegman, director of the Kellogg junior leadership program at the University of Florida, addressed some 300 delegates yesterday at a community college conference sponsored by the University of Kentucky here this week. UK oversees the community colleges.

Dr. Raymond Schultz of Florida State University praised the community college as offering a way to overcome the deficiencies of huge senior colleges. He said it offers a liberal education for students who do not plan to go on to a senior college as well as training students who do expect to transfer to one.

Florida's community colleges had nearly 75,000 students last year, nearly two-thirds of its total college enrollment.

Wiegman noted that three factors indicate Kentucky's community college system is going to succeed:

The commitment to the program by Dr. John W. Oswald, UK president.

The selection of blue-ribbon people for advisory boards at each of the community colleges, bringing existing community leadership to bear on the problems they face.

The imminent construction of community college service centers at each of the existing schools.

The conference brings together directors, faculty members and advisory board members from the nine community colleges in the University of Kentucky system.

Where Is L.B.J.'s Old Realism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Chamberlain's column in the Washington Post of January 29 emphasizes the change which has taken place in President Johnson's attitude from the time that he was Senate majority leader. This is a thought-provoking analysis worthy of study. His column follows:

THESE DAYS: WHERE IS L.B.J.'S OLD REALISM?

(By John Chamberlain)

When Lyndon Johnson was boss of the U.S. Senate, he had an exquisitely tuned sense of realism. He knew when WAYNE MORSE, the wild man of Oregon, could be driven in tandem with, say, DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia. He knew how to alter a phrase in a bill to win a kingdom. As Tommy Corcoran of New Deal days fame said of the old conjuror, "If a vote is needed, Lyndon can find it in a rathole."

The Presidency, however, seems to be doing something to veil the eyes of the old master. He is pressing too hard to clinch victories that he has already won, and he is neglecting to push at some barriers that are ready for toppling.

The change was apparent in the emphases of his state of the Union message. There was all that strain to assure the liberal community that even if he had to mastermind an accelerated war in southeast Asia, there would be no important diminution in the push to the Great Society.

The net effect of this was to scare half the people into thinking that we are on the threshold of terrifying deficiency appropriations which will lead to a bad inflation, while the other half was frightened into thinking that we must cut and run in South Vietnam in order to save up enough money to purify the Hudson River and rebuild 30 major cities.

The old Lyndon Johnson wouldn't have risked the confusion and the dispiriting cross arguments that have resulted from promising to get a million and one extra things out of an economy that is already employing just about everybody who is capable of adding to the gross national product. Realism would have impelled the President to say that, since mass unemployment was disappearing, many of the problems of 1964 and early 1965 were vanishing, too. In other words, many of the Great Society goals were being brought within the reach of individuals for the simple reason that they now had money in their pockets to pay for what they needed, including beautifying their yards to please Lady Bird.

The old Lyndon would have taken all the credit in the world for the current prosperity. He would have gone on from there to congratulate the teenagers who had found jobs. Addressing himself to the school dropouts among them, he would have advised them to spend some of their new wages on make-up courses in night school, warning them against the day when the job market might shrink. And he would have said something reassuring about the advantage accruing to the Federal budget when businesses are in a position to recruit and train their own work forces without asking for Government assistance.

The old Lyndon Johnson would have had a word to say about the easing of the civil rights problem that must come when jobs are plentiful. He would have pointed to the experience of President Jerome Holland of Hampton Institute, one of the older Negro colleges.

Just 6 years ago, says Holland, "we had six major corporations recruiting our graduates. Last year, we had 150 corporations on our campus recruiting our graduates. And in 1966 we expect over 200. The youngster in chemistry, for many years, either went into medical school or perhaps he was drained off into graduate school. But now, this youngster is thinking about Dow Chemical, Du Pont and Union Carbide. It's a wonderful feeling to an old-timer like myself to walk into an airport and see one of my students. I'll ask him 'What are you doing in the airport? Are you going home?' 'Oh, no, Dr. Holland,' he'll say, 'I'm going out to California to be interviewed by Kaiser Aluminum.' Things really look good."

With a Negro educator talking that way, the old Lyndon Johnson would still have called for more money for Operation Head Start in the slums. But he would also have noted that the Government need concern itself less with providing jobs for the talented.

As for Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz's mean-spirited drive on foreign agricultural labor, the old Lyndon would have told him to relax and let the Mexicans take the farm jobs. This would permit native-born Americans to go to the factories, where they are needed.

Thinking it over, Lyndon Johnson didn't tell us about the real state of the Union. Could be that his mind was on 1935 and the days of the WPA.

The Renewed Bombing of North Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 31, 1966

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the Democratic leadership announced to the House that President Johnson had ordered resumption of bombing in Vietnam. Of special interest to me was the statement that the issue of peace in Vietnam had been referred by the President to the Security Council of the United Nations.

I have had misgivings about resumption of bombing and still have with regard to acceleration of the war. Especially, Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the failure—indeed the opposition of our State Department to a policy of asking all free world nations to boycott North Vietnam. I have felt we should bar our ports to foreign ships that supply the enemy.

Furthermore, I have urged that Congress bring out all the facts by a full debate on the war.

But, today, Mr. Speaker, I must support our President. Right along I have said that if I had any doubts or uncertainties about what the United States should do, I would support President Johnson. He has the full facts; I do not.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join today the Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken out in support of President Johnson's decision. He has done what he believed to be in the best interests of our Nation. I know he has had a difficult decision, and I think the least I can do, as a Republican, is indicate a solidarity that exists across the aisle of the House of Representatives.

So I say to President Johnson: I support you. You have taken the course you believe best will protect and support our GI's in southeast Asia.

This, I say to the President, is a time when you need my support, and you have it.

General Westmoreland's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, in South Carolina we are proud of Gen. William C. Westmoreland. The American people and the people of the free world are proud of his superb leadership and dedication to the cause of freedom. The following editorial appeared in the State, Columbia, S.C., January 22. I commend this splendid editorial to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, Jan. 22, 1966]

An Awesome Command

The commander in Vietnam does indeed work under fundamental policy as set in Washington, but the responsibility of Gen. William C. Westmoreland is nevertheless an awesome one.

Every decision cannot possibly be made in the White House and the Pentagon. The on-the-scene judgment of General Westmoreland is constantly under severe test.

One misjudgment, in this sensitive situation, could conceivably trigger the enlargement or internationalization of the conflict and possibly become a spark of destructive world war.

Even an incident, one beyond the control and vigilence of the commander, could set off the fires of general war and, in the circumstances, the blame can fall on the commander.

General Westmoreland is responsible not only for his men and the success of this stand against communism under most difficult circumstances, but he directs an effort which could easily and perilously expand itself and affect millions. This is a world responsibility. Out of it, and out of his able exercise of it, have come honors this South Carolinian richly deserves. His designation by Time magazine as "man of the year" is an outward manifestation of General Westmoreland's distinguished service to his country—and to the free world. Time makes its annual selection on an international basis.

Before this year's selection by the magazine was announced, Columbia's stations WIS–TV and WIS had determined upon the designation of General Westmoreland as its choice for "man of the year" in South Carolina.

Undoubtedly, Americans generally join South Carolinians in their pride over the general and his conduct of his complex assignment. And if there should be any lack of appreciation and recognition elsewhere in the free world the negligence is not excusable. He is directing a resistance to totalitarianism in the interest of free men everywhere, and the responsibility is staggering.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the Record.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the Congressional Record, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the Record at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the Record should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).